

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1880.

## The Week.

WE are still without a word of information from the friends of General Grant as to what he will do to secure his inauguration, in case he is not satisfied with the manner in which Congress counts the electoral vote. That he will do *something* very summary and effective we have been frequently assured, but there is a very extraordinary reluctance to describe it. We have already mentioned that one paper declared he would summon 500,000 veteran soldiers to assist him in revising the count, but this has been denied by others, who say that he will not revise the count, but will so frighten the Democrats beforehand that there will be no need to revise it—*i.e.*, that they will count him in somehow. How he will frighten them, however, does not appear. There are no precedents to throw any light on the matter. Mr. Tilden was not satisfied with the count and said he was cheated, but the counters were not frightened by this in the least, and his opponent got and kept the place. It is high time that the whole programme should be laid before the public. The Philadelphia *Bulletin* apparently knows what it is, but will not tell.

The *Herald* of Saturday published an "interview" with Senator Conkling of a rather extraordinary description, for it appears that in this instance the Senator sought the interviewer and not the interviewer the Senator. The correspondent (Mr. Nordhoff) writes that the report of the interview was sent to him by Mr. Conkling with a request that if published it should be given without any alteration or suppression whatever. The substance of it is, 1st, that Mr. Conkling is entirely confident that General Grant will be nominated at Chicago and triumphantly elected in November; 2d, that the opposition to his nomination, having taken the menacing attitude of a "bolt," ought to be crushed out, because any party which allows itself to be swerved by the threats of deserters is doomed to early death and ought to die. Probably the interview will have a contrary effect from that intended by its author. It is not Mr. Conkling's habit to cry out when he is not hurt. When things are going in a way to suit him his cave does not resound; his bearing is that of self-satisfied and awful calm. If he has found it necessary to rush suddenly into print by the back door the henchmen will probably interpret his action as a sign of trouble, of which, in fact, there are other scraps of evidence in Pennsylvania and Illinois as well as in New York. As regards the threatened bolt against General Grant and the proper course to be pursued in consequence of it, Mr. Conkling will not persuade any considerable number of henchmen that the Chicago Convention is called together in order to put up a candidate so obnoxious that he will split the party. The common belief in the political quarter to which his remarks are addressed is, that conventions assemble to nominate the man upon whom the largest number of voters are likely to unite; and that it is the steady pursuit of this policy rather than the opposite which conduces to party longevity.

An interview with Senator Carpenter touching the Grant movement, reported by the *New York Times*, is very entertaining reading. He bases his opinion that the Wisconsin delegation will support Grant not on any information received, but on his "estimate of the intelligence of the people," which is probably a much more convenient source of knowledge. We need hardly say that he also thinks that "in no campaign since the war" has it been "more absolutely essential to the welfare of the country that the Republican party should succeed than it is at present." In fact, Republican success grows "more absolutely essential" every year. The opposition to a third term he considers "a sickly sentimentality, howl-

ing in . . . the interest of candidates who have not had a first term." As to the prospect of success in case of Grant's nomination, the Senator relies mainly "on an overruling Providence, even in politics." That he was likely to take a religious view of the matter was clearly indicated at the close of his speech in the Fitz-John Porter case, when he demanded Grant's election in order to secure "discrimination between vice and virtue." There has been a too general belief that Senator Carpenter wanted Grant back in power in order to restore the reign of the old "Senatorial Group," of which he was himself a prominent member, and that he really did not "rely on an overruling Providence in politics" to any great extent, nor greatly care to have "discrimination between vice and virtue" made part of the work of the President. This conversation, therefore, not only shows how greatly a statesman may in these days be misjudged, but what a remarkable moral growth has been going on in the Group during their chief's absence in Europe.

Postmaster-General Key has resigned his seat in the Cabinet in order to accept a United States judgeship, but it is said, as if by authority, that the President will appoint no successor until after the Chicago Convention. The reasons alleged for this delay are Mr. Hayes's desire to avoid the appearance of favoring any one of the rival Republican candidates for President, in case his appointee should be a friend of one of them; and his purpose after the Convention "to give the position to some one identified with the interests of the Republican nominee." The mixture of delicacy and confused perception which these motives betray make it highly probable that they are truthfully ascribed to Mr. Hayes. We say nothing of the propriety of assuming that the new Postmaster-General will probably, as the result of the November elections, be able to hold over the next Administration. But what ought to trouble a civil-service reformer is to point out the connection between a public service like the Post Office and the "interests" of a politician striving for the Presidency; and to show that scruples about the appearance of "fixing" a department to determine the party nomination, should not be accompanied by scruples about fixing it to determine the election in conformity with the nomination. "Interests" up to the time of the Convention are "claims"—Mr. Blaine's, Mr. Sherman's, or General Grant's; and another name for those "identified" with them is "workers" or "henchmen." We are not aware of any provision for these in the conception of our form of Government, or in those sections of the Constitution which relate to the Executive.

That Mr. Key's so-called assistant, Mr. Tyner, is not promptly promoted to the vacancy will, to those who recall whose "interests" the latter represented three years ago, seem like an indignity to the shade of the late Senator Morton. But perhaps Mr. Tyner is already identified with new and living interests, and only bides his time; and indeed he has but to cast in his lot openly with some one of the Favorite Sons to perfect his title to the succession if fortune smiles on the candidate of his choice. Mr. Hayes has been advised on all hands to put Postmaster James of this city in place of Judge Key, but we suspect that Mr. James is the last man to favor such a transfer. He knows very well that his standing in this community is so strong that it should be morally impossible for a Democratic Administration to remove him. The attempt would doubtless be made, but it would be resisted and might be thwarted. As a Cabinet officer no mercy would be shown him, and his services here or in Washington would count for nothing. He is enough of a Republican politician to be out of place in a Democratic ministry; not enough of one where he is now to warrant even an overwhelmingly victorious Democracy in dismissing him.

The Republicans of Ohio, South Carolina, California, and Arkansas, and the Democrats of Pennsylvania and Connecticut, have

held conventions during the week to select delegates to Chicago and Cincinnati. The Ohio Republicans instructed their delegates-at-large, and requested the district delegates, to support Sherman. The California Convention pledged both district and State delegates to Blaine, as it was, of course, conceded beforehand that it would. Arkansas and South Carolina both gave formal instructions for Grant, though there is a discouraged uncertainty felt in Grant circles, we believe, as to the strict obedience of the delegation from the latter State. In Pennsylvania the Democratic Convention was "captured" by the Randall faction through the efforts of the ever-faithful McMullin, but the majority of the Cincinnati delegation is said to be anti-Tilden; the reverse is reported of Connecticut, where the Convention was by no means harmonious, and in neither State were there instructions given.

The roving political correspondent of the *New York Times*, whose partisanship must give the highest satisfaction to his employers, has undertaken to show that Mr. Sherman's "substantial support" at the Ohio Convention was really a substantial defeat. In the course of his review of the proceedings he remarks:

"A delegate from Hamilton County, who has had the good sense to carefully conceal his identity, offered a resolution reaffirming the anti-third-term resolution passed by the Ohio Convention of 1875. It was laughed out of sight, only three members [of the Platform Committee] giving it their support."

The resolution in question declared that the observance of Washington's example "will be in the future, as it has been in the past, regarded as a fundamental rule in the unwritten law of the Republic." That the mere mention of this only five years after its solemn adoption should excite the risibles, proves afresh that the sense of humor among politicians is developed out of all proportion to the historical sense. The reporter adds his tribute to the transparent absurdity of the incident by expressing his gratification that the idiot whose memory was good for half a decade had the decency "to carefully conceal his identity."

The South Carolina Republicans had almost as lively an experience as that of their Georgia brethren the previous week. The *Times*—which, by the way, the convention publicly thanked for its "fearless exposition" of the Whittaker case—reports the same "infamous trickery" on the part of the anti-Grant forces which the Georgia third-term opponents exhibited, and which the readers of the *Times* know characterizes the opposition to Grant everywhere. As usual, too, it was the Sherman men rather than Blaine's supporters who exhibited the most brazen effrontery, Collector Brayton's "paid satellites" being especially active. Owing to their machinations—although, as the resolutions stated, "from the mountains to the sea-board the Republican pulse beats for Grant and for Grant only"—it turns out that there are four Blaine and four Sherman men in the delegation chosen and but six for Grant; hence the anxiety about the majority voting against its will and in obedience to its instructions. Judging from its abandoned character we should be inclined to doubt it. As an "echo" of the Georgia convention, we observe that a "movement" has been originated, among the opponents of the resolution adopted giving three-fourths of the Federal patronage to colored men, to prevent such a consummation. In South Carolina, too, since the convention there have been signs of discord which nothing but a third term seems likely to check. Apparently in these two States the "color-line" is in danger from the unexpected discovery of white Republicans that they can no longer lead the bulk of the party.

In Maine, although the opinion of the Supreme Court gave the Republican Legislature and Governor a legal footing, some county officers still hold office under certificates issued by the late Governor. An elected county commissioner in Cumberland County, having taken the oath of office before a *dedimus* justice, has brought suit against the Democratic incumbent under the Governor's certificate before a single judge of the Supreme Court and obtained a decision in his favor, but the case goes by appeal before the full bench, and

so prolongs still further one aspect of the contest. But the final decision, in view of the expressed opinion of the judges, is no matter of doubt. If their former decision on the statement of facts presented to them by Senators and Representatives was in favor of the elected candidates, despite defects in the returns, it will not be different on the judges' principle of taking notice of notorious facts, whether brought before them judicially or not, after the report of the Hale Investigating Committee so-called. Garcelon retained funds of the State and continued to make payments on account of the late disturbances for three months after the end of his term of office. The statute provision of 1864, by which the Governor was to issue certificates to such persons as might "appear to be elected," was pronounced doubtfully constitutional by the Supreme Court, but still remains a law, barring the commentary of the court upon it, having been referred by the last to the next Legislature.

The Senate has been the more active house of Congress during the week. On Wednesday Mr. Davis, of West Virginia, who for some two years has been alleging suspicious discrepancies in the Treasury accounts and statements, and who was finally allowed the chairmanship of an investigating committee, presented his (majority) report: but it was not read, and he had no definite word to give of his discoveries except that they fully confirmed his original assertions. He had found differences of ninety to a hundred millions of dollars, but he could not say that a hundred cents had wrongfully disappeared from the Treasury. All that transpires is what was known before, that since the Treasury report of 1870-71 there has been a change for the better in the Department's book-keeping. On Thursday and Friday Mr. Allison's amendment to the bill authorizing a retired list for non-commissioned officers, by which the President is required to appoint two colored cadets annually to West Point, was debated with some animation, General Burnside favoring it even to the point of wishing the Academy abolished if it could not stand the color-test. Mr. Hoar objected to embodying race discriminations in legislation, and Mr. Dawes proposed five instead of two appointments, leaving the President free to make them of any color he pleased. Mr. Conkling seemed inclined to stop making any more white appointments until the black man's past exclusion from West Point had been amply compensated. The Kellogg debate was renewed, and the Indian Bill passed.

The President has vetoed the Deficiency Bill in a short message, in which he bases his objection on the fact that the bill contains a rider to the appropriation which "materially changes, and by implication repeals, important parts of the laws for the regulation of United States elections," and therefore "gives marked and deliberate sanction" to the practice of tacking upon appropriation bills general and permanent legislation, thus inviting "attacks upon the independence and constitutional powers of the Executive by providing an easy and effective way of constraining executive discretion." He acknowledges that the practice has been resorted to by all political parties when clothed with power, but says "it did not prevail until forty years after the adoption of the Constitution, and, it is confidently believed, is condemned by the enlightened judgment of the country," and shows that it is forbidden in State legislation by more than half the State constitutions. This is safe and strong ground. The Republicans in Congress are said to be displeased with the confession that the Republicans have ever done such things. The sensible course for the Democrats now to pursue would seem to be the passage of the Deficiency Bill pure and simple, and the embodiment of the general and permanent legislation in a separate bill. But, if we are to judge by the past, the thing they are most likely to do is to raise the cry that the President is assailing the independence of the legislature, and proceed to disgust and alarm the country by fighting him on this issue. There is hardly anything in this particular field of unwisdom of which they do not seem capable.

There is nothing new in the Whittaker trial. Five experts have been at work trying to discover the authorship of the note of warn-



ing received by Whittaker. Two have declined to frame any definite conclusion, while three are said to have formed positive opinions; but nothing is known as to the person to whom they point, nor is it known whether they agree in pointing to the same person. We have commented elsewhere on some of the features in the proceeding, and have nothing to add except that the indiscretion of the Government in appointing wild counsel to attack their own officers, seems to have been equalled by General Schofield's issuing a general order to the cadets of a congratulatory and sympathetic character, which, if it means anything, means that he thinks that none of them had anything to do with the outrage, which is the very point under judicial investigation. There is greater quiet about the affair among the newspapers, as it seems less promising for political purposes than it did at the outset.

The Wall Street markets were all unsettled during the week by the action of the Albany Legislature, which passed a bill imposing taxes on foreign capital used within the State which, it was estimated, would be equal, with the tax already paid, to about three per cent. per annum. The bill, which was aimed at nearly thirty millions of foreign capital employed in this city, has been vetoed by the Governor. When it was thought, however, that it would be enacted there was great alarm among the foreign bankers, who had made many millions of demand loans—the Bank of Montreal agency alone having had outstanding nine millions of dollars. This money, or a good part of it, was immediately called in by the foreign bankers, and used, to a large extent, in buying bills on London. The result was that the rates for loans here and for bills on London advanced, and a very unsettled feeling prevailed. The speculators at the Stock Exchange made the most of this, and drove down prices in the stock market. Towards the end of the week there were assurances from Albany that the bill would not become a law, when the rates for foreign exchange fell back, as did also the rates for money, but the stock market had become so thoroughly demoralized that the recovery there was fitful and feverish. The general business of the country continues excellent. Immigration was never so large, and railroad earnings continue to be enormous. The New York banks continue to gain currency, and their surplus reserve now amounts to about \$3,500,000.

The composition of the English Cabinet has been definitively announced during the week. Gladstone has, as from the first seemed all but inevitable, taken the Premiership. Even if he had not, his reputation as a legislator and financier, the part he has played in the late canvass, and the fact that he has undoubtedly more than any other man the whole body of Liberal voters at his back, would have made his acceptance of the first place imperative. He has settled his differences with the Radicals by giving both Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain seats in the Cabinet, and he will be his own Chancellor of the Exchequer. Lord Hartington takes the Foreign Office, and Sir William Harcourt the Home Office. Lord Selborne, better known perhaps as Sir Roundell Palmer, is the English Chancellor. Mr. W. E. Forster's acceptance of the Secretaryship for Ireland seems to indicate that Irish questions are to occupy a considerable share of the attention of the new Government. Earl Cowper goes to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, with a very large income and a very mild and conciliatory disposition. The success of the Government in satisfying the Chamberlain Radicals is a serious blow to the Home-Rulers, whose only hope of making any impression on the House lay in occasional co-operation with malcontent Liberals. Probably nobody has been more surprised by all these changes than the Queen, who had apparently surrendered herself in an unusual degree to the Beaconsfield influence, and had probably accepted as absolutely trustworthy his assurances that Gladstone's career was closed.

The Marquis of Ripon, who was one of the negotiators of the Washington Treaty in this country, but retired from public life soon after in consequence of his conversion to Catholicism, goes to India

as Governor-General in place of Lord Lytton, who comes home at once. He takes with him Gordon Pasha as private secretary, which is a somewhat significant circumstance. No man living has had a wider experience of Eastern life and politics than Gordon, and he has recently published a letter in which he passes wholesale condemnation on the Treaty of Berlin, which he says has served the purpose of Russia much more effectively than the Treaty of San Stefano would have done, by keeping the Slavic principalities in a disturbed and uncertain condition, and deprived of access to the sea. Afghan affairs since the fall of Ghazni appear to be slowly approaching a solution of some kind. Mohammed Jan is said to have surrendered and brought Musa Khan in with him, but Abderrahman Khan is still at large and has to be reckoned with. It is worth noting that in the recent expeditions of the troops for the chastisement of turbulent tribes villages have not been burnt, or any permanent damage inflicted beyond blowing up the towers of the chiefs.

One of the most startling revelations made by the election is the total lack of influence on the voters of the country at large of the London daily press. Gladstone had every daily paper of note in London except the *Daily News* dead against him. Indeed, most of them treated him as a half-crazy person, and as in some sense a national disgrace, at the very time when he was rousing a confidence and even an enthusiasm among the mass of the voters such as have perhaps been bestowed on no man in England since the younger Pitt. The effect on the London clubs of the discovery that there was in politics another and more powerful England, which they knew nothing about, is said to have been almost comic in its surprise. The chief opponent of Gladstone in the London press was the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and it carried its opposition to such a pitch of fury that his triumph made some kind of smash-up in the organization of the paper inevitable. Accordingly, the public was probably not surprised to hear soon after the election that it had changed hands, and that the new proprietor had called on the editor to change his policy, and that the latter had refused to do so, and had retired bag and baggage, carrying his contributors with him.

The ability of the *Gazette* under its late editor, Mr. James Greenwood, was very great in every department. The editorial writing has never been surpassed anywhere either in finish or fulness of knowledge or dialectical skill, and, considering the violence of its partisanship, the absolute colorlessness which it maintained in its news columns was very remarkable, and made it very valuable. But hatred of Gladstone and Russia, from 1876 on, took with the editor the character of a veritable mania, destroyed his sense of proportion, and seriously damaged his judgment as an observer both of home and foreign politics. At one time he seemed not unlikely to add to this admiration of the Turks, which would, had it lasted, have completed his mental ruin, but he threw this off after the war. He announces his intention of starting a new paper as a sort of continuation of the *Gazette*, but it must needs differ from it greatly, with Gladstone Prime Minister and England undeniably supporting him. The old view that Gladstone is a verbose lunatic engaged in encouraging those incarnate devils, the Russians, to annex Southeastern Europe and reduce England to the position of a third-rate power, cannot be preached any longer and made to pay expenses.

The Italian Ministry have dissolved Parliament and again gone to the country in quest of a working majority, which they have not had, and in the absence of which Parliamentary proceedings have been a mere faction fight. They have published an address in which, after castigating the opposition, they promise an abolition of the grist-tax, which is the most obnoxious of all the burdens imposed since the establishment of the kingdom, and an extension of the suffrage. This last seems absolutely necessary to give any vigor or activity to Italian politics, but it must be confessed that it would be a leap in the dark. The present voters care but little for their political responsibilities, but who knows how the new ones would regard them?

## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE WHITTAKER CASE.

WE have not discussed the Whittaker case on its merits, and do not propose to do so now, for the simple reason that it is still *sub judice*. The enquiry going on at West Point has for its object to find out whether Whittaker has been guilty of a piece of imposture, or certain of the cadets guilty of an act of great barbarity. As long as it lasts attempts to influence opinion about it, by attacks either on the court, on Whittaker, or on the other cadets, in the columns of newspapers, are indecent and unfair. That some of our daily contemporaries have not taken this view of the matter everybody knows. They have sent reporters to the scene to collect evidence on their own account and in their own way, and these reporters, we happen to know, have been guilty of suppression, of evasion, of false suggestion, and, in some cases, of deliberate manufacture of "dampning facts." This would be bad enough, if it had not been followed up by editorial comments containing furious attacks on the government of the Academy, on the Court of Enquiry, and on the whole body of white cadets, ostensibly in the interest of "human rights," but really, as we believe, for the purpose of giving to the Whittaker case enough of the appearance of an old-fashioned "outrage" to make it useful in the coming Presidential canvass. In fact, no incident has of late called forth grosser displays of "journalism." We have ourselves in common with other papers fallen into one error with regard to the proceedings now pending at West Point which we ought to correct. We found fault with the court for apparently starting out with Whittaker's guilt as a working hypothesis, and treating him from the first moment as the person on trial. It seems, however, that the very nature of the procedure made this necessary and regular. The post-surgeon who made the report on his case, after he was found tied in his room, expressed the belief, owing doubtless to the slight nature of his injuries, that he was himself the author of them. Whittaker thereupon very properly demanded a court of enquiry as an officer suffering from a dishonoring imputation. A military court of enquiry, convened under such circumstances, is not a court-martial or a court of law, but resembles a grand jury or a court of honor. Its chief business is to ascertain whether the imputations are well founded, and the person asking for the court is, of course, the first person to be examined, and *his* chief business is to clear himself. It is only, therefore, after he has been pronounced blameless that the question, who committed the wrong if he did not, comes up for investigation.

The conduct of the Government in the matter has been very puzzling. The officers of the Academy are officers in the military service of the Government. They are, from General Schofield down, under the absolute control of the War Department. The cadets are to all intents and purposes a regiment of the regular Army. The Court of Enquiry is in all its doings under the orders of the President. Its members are his agents, and are doing his work. He can supervise or modify or rebuke their mode of proceeding if he thinks proper. These things being true, the appearance on the scene of a civil lawyer, under Government retainer, to watch the case, and assist in its conduct, may be perfectly proper and comprehensible. But the selection for this duty of a very notoriously partisan, political, and indiscreet lawyer, in whose composition the judicial faculty has not the smallest place, and his use of his position to taunt or inveigh against the school, its discipline and morality, and cast imputations on the honor of its governing officers, are things hard to understand, and have a very unpleasant look of a desire, even on the part of the Administration, to make political capital out of the affair.

That it should be possible to make political capital out of it is due to the great and creditable sensitiveness of the Northern public regarding the treatment of negroes by whites everywhere, and especially in places in which the authority of the United States is supreme. It is this sensitiveness, however, which excites and rewards the shameful journalistic excesses which we have mentioned above. It acts as a sort of standing incentive to a certain class of politicians, and to their organs in the press, both to invent outrages

on negroes where none is committed, and to exaggerate the numbers and atrocity of those which are committed. This West Point affair promised in the beginning to answer their purpose very well as furnishing a specimen of the kind of thing the Democrats would tolerate or wink at if in power, but the unfortunate revelation that the most prominent of Whittaker's persecutors or despisers in the school have been the sons of Northern Republicans and the nominees of Republican Congressmen, has naturally greatly diminished its importance for political purposes. The fact that Whittaker, however, whether the innocent victim of the recent outrage or not, has been systematically excluded from the society and good-fellowship of his white comrades remains, and it is a very unpleasant fact. No person of ordinary humanity likes to think of a well-behaved lad, who is working hard for his education, passing four years in this sort of crushing isolation, especially in a Government institution. But here again many people in their anger have talked as if West Point were a charitable institution, and as if the mere fact that its students do not pay any part of their own expenses deprives them of the right to choose their own associates and acquaintances which they possess in other colleges. This is, however, a very erroneous view. The West Point student enters the Academy under a contract by which he agrees to give the Government the benefit of the military skill and knowledge which it communicates in return for four years' board and instruction. The advantages are about equal on both sides. He owes it no sacrifice of tastes or habits but what military discipline calls for, and the cadets naturally resent the popular view which the Whittaker case has called out. Moreover, in comparing the position of colored youths at West Point with their position in other colleges, it is often forgotten that the association of the students at the former is much closer than at the latter. The college at West Point takes possession of the cadet's entire day as a soldier doing duty with his regiment. It fixes his dinner-hour, his bed-hour, the clothes he is to wear, and the area he may walk over, and puts him in relation of authority and obedience or close comradeship in the ranks and in the schoolroom from morning till night. The consequence is that a disagreeable comrade is far more disagreeable at West Point than he would be at any other college, and any sign of repugnance to him far more noticeable. There are, say, at Harvard 1,200 white students and 1 colored one. Of these 1,200 1,150 might rigidly abstain from holding any intercourse with the colored student, and the fact would never be noticed by him or anybody else. The large liberty of the place would hide it. So that when we ask a West Point cadet to give up his prejudice about the color or any other peculiarity of another cadet, we ask for more than is asked from the students of Yale, or Harvard, or Columbia.

As to this prejudice against color, we said recently that the cadets brought it from their homes. This was so notorious a fact in our eyes that we hardly expected it to be questioned. It has, however, been questioned by several correspondents, but the facts with which they support their contradiction are just numerous enough to prove the rule. They have seen colored ministers well received at a religious convention, and have known of two or three colored boys being well treated at a university, or have met a highly respectable colored man at a friend's dinner-table. We do not deny these phenomena, and are glad to believe they are on the increase. But we will mention a few things which they have *not* seen at the North, and which tell the whole story. They have never seen, outside of anti-slavery circles, a social gathering composed of persons of any but the lowest class made up of white and colored people indiscriminately. They have never seen a white and a colored family of any but the poorest and most ignorant class living on terms of familiar intercourse—fathers, mothers, and young people of both sexes. They have never seen white worshippers sitting regularly under a colored preacher, or a congregation made up of white and colored people in equal or nearly equal numbers sitting under any preacher. They have rarely seen a white woman marry a black man, or a white man a black woman, in any but the poorest and most ignorant class, with the approbation of her or his



friends. They have never seen colored people admitted to a hotel mainly dependent on white patronage, nor have they often known a man to let a house in a good neighborhood to a colored man, however respectable.

Now, calling attention to these highly significant facts is not, as some good people like to believe, the same thing as approving of them. The inference we draw from them is, that in judging the conduct of the cadets towards their colored comrades we are asking from the lads a display of virtue which we do not expect from their fathers and mothers, and we lash ourselves in our honest indignation into the belief that we can cure this evil at West Point, according to the fashion of the times, simply by more and sterner legislation. Our own notion is, and we submit it with much diffidence, that what West Point needs most of all is assimilation to the other colleges of the country in the mode of feeding its classes. The present system of educating at Government expense such lads as Congressmen send up is valuable to nobody but Congressmen. In saying this we are far from seeking to cast any reflection on the education the school supplies. Judged by its results in the production, from the material sent it in this strange manner, of the men who for the past eighty years have left it to become for long or short periods the officers of the regular Army, we know of no educational institution in the country which can for a moment be compared to it. We know of none which has made on the character of its graduates such a marked impression that they may be said to constitute a class in the community of more than ordinary honor and devotion to their duty, and contentment with the daily work of their hands. But we have little doubt that if, as in other colleges, the students selected themselves—that is, came because they were eager for education and were willing to pay something for it—instead of being picked out by Congressmen, the tone of the Academy on a great variety of subjects would be much more nearly in harmony with public opinion out-of-doors than it now is. We may add that those who at present send colored boys there ought to be careful to select such as will physically and intellectually hold their own, and do their race credit in the eyes of those with whom they have to live, and whose respect will for four years be so necessary to their comfort. Whittaker's readiness to be pummelled without resistance gives him in the eyes of many good people a fresh claim on their sympathy, but boys who are to raise their race in the estimation of Anglo-Saxons must be made of sterner stuff. There never will come a time when a patient, long-suffering soldier will not seem a contemptible object to those who are learning war as a trade; and the colored cadets who will do most good at West Point, and in the long run please the Northern public best, will be those who will not merely earn approbation by their diligence and sweetness of disposition, but be able and willing to thrash any brother undergraduates who act unpleasantly towards them.

#### THE PENNSYLVANIA PARDONS.

THE case of Kemble and his associates, recently convicted of bribery, or attempted bribery, of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and now released from punishment by the Board of Pardons and the Governor, is closely related to the communistic outbreak of 1877, which had its origin in a reduction of wages believed to be necessary by the employers of labor. Resistance to this reduction was made in several States simultaneously, and everywhere it took the form of seizure of the employers' property by the employees. In some cases the latter dismissed the agents of the former and worked the property on their own account. In others—and this was the case in Pennsylvania, and notably so in Pittsburgh—they possessed themselves of the property, brought all business to a standstill, and eventually, finding themselves in danger of being dislodged by superior force, set fire to everything combustible and burned up some millions of dollars' worth of goods and machinery. A number of lives were lost in the rioting, and the shock was felt from one end of the country to the other. A similar state of things has been chronic in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania for many years, and notwith-

standing the execution of a number of murderers in that district the Molly Maguires are by no means extinct.

The losses at Pittsburgh fell primarily upon the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. In order to recoup themselves they had recourse in the first instance to lawsuits against the municipality where the riots took place. This process being too slow and uncertain, they appealed to the Legislature with a bill appropriating a lump sum from the State treasury, and one, it is now alleged, greatly in excess of the losses actually suffered. The bill was, of course, stoutly opposed by the taxpayers of the State. Kemble, formerly treasurer of the State, a bank president and an influential member of the ruling faction in State politics, then appeared upon the scene with a number of minor criminals, and was shortly detected in an attempt to bribe the Legislature to pass the appropriation. Great excitement followed the discovery. The Grand Jury indicted the culprits. The State went to great expense in the employment of counsel to prosecute them. They were finally brought to trial; some of them confessed their guilt; others denied and were convicted; some still remain to be tried. Shortly before the date for pronouncing sentence upon them they forfeited their bail and ran away. Kemble came first to New York on important business, he said, and afterwards retired to a fashionable watering-place to recruit his health. The press argued that it would be impossible for him to remain away—his business in Pennsylvania was too extensive and important—but that he had probably gone for a respite to make arrangements for a pardon. It was hinted that he was the possessor of so many of the secrets of the ruling dynasty in State politics that it would be unsafe even to send him to prison. All this may or may not be true. What is certain is that he and his fellow-culprits came back, were sentenced to a term of confinement in the penitentiary, and were pardoned after a few days' imprisonment. The Board of Pardons and the State Executive made some little apology to the public by quibbling over the phraseology of the sentence of the Court, and assumed the virtue of not remitting the small pecuniary fine and the legal disabilities which formed part of the punishment. The fine was of no importance to any of the culprits, and will probably be paid out of the funds in hand as part of the expenses of bribing the Legislature. As for the disabilities, they will probably be removed in due time if the people of Pennsylvania submit with good grace to what has already been done.

The *Tribune's* Philadelphia correspondent says that public sentiment in that city is not much stirred by these events, and that a good deal of sympathy exists for the convicts on account of the severity of the judge's sentence. No public reception has been tendered to Kemble on his escape from the sheriff's clutches, and we conclude, therefore, that differences of opinion are tolerated regarding the affair. The people of Pennsylvania are not so unlike those of other civilized states that they can fail to appreciate the moral bearings and consequences of the transaction. After some little reflection, they must perceive that there is no lower depth for a community to reach than a general understanding that the laws exist for only one class of offenders—that the benighted delver in a coal-mine must suffer their extreme penalty for his misdeeds, while the rich and influential member of a political "ring" only needs to pay a paltry fine for crimes calculated to poison the whole body politic by corrupting the very source of law. The Pennsylvania Board of Pardons and the Governor of the State won general commendation not long since by the resistance they offered to appeals for pardon for the convicted Molly Maguires. In these cases they exhibited not only the proper firmness as guardians of public order, but a high degree of patience and judicial fairness in their treatment of the several applications presented to them. But when one of their own associates comes before them in felon's garb "the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks," and they stand exposed, no less than Kemble himself, as the counterfeits and base coin of magistracy.

If public opinion in Pennsylvania is disposed to make light of this matter, or is even divided upon it in a very considerable

degree, there is a class in that State, as elsewhere, on whom the lesson of it will not be lost. The men who burned the Pittsburgh shops and depots, the anthracite miners, the iron-workers, the whole body of wage laborers, have been careful observers of the drama from the beginning, waiting to see whether it would end in a solemn vindication of the law or turn out to be a farce. They will infallibly draw the conclusion that there are two sorts of justice in store in Harrisburg, one for them and their kind and another for Kemble and his kind: one for the poor and another for the rich: one for the laborer and another for the capitalist. In times of future trouble, when, perhaps, the torch of the Communist is again seen in Pittsburgh or some other trembling city, what kind of an argument is to be addressed to the mob by Governor Hoyt, Attorney-General Palmer, Counsellor Quay, and their associates? Whatever protection we have, or can have, in this country, is the protection of law, and law is but the expression of public opinion. The mob itself is a part of the public, and it frequently happens that the restraining influence of the law, the conviction that it is right and that it must prevail because it is right, is more effective in quelling turbulence than any display of force that can be made. But to conserve this invaluable influence and restraining power it is necessary that all should see that the law is impartial and that justice holds her scales even. It is of course not the Molly Maguire who must needs quake when a rich convict goes scot free, but "society," which is put in peril; the men who have saved something; the class which stands for civilization and for whatever is of enduring value in the estimation of the world.

Some lame attempts at excuse for the pardons have been made on the ground that the statute against bribery in Pennsylvania is of recent origin, that these are the first convictions, that imprisonment at labor is not warranted by the law, that the bill which Kemble & Co. were trying to carry by bribery through the Legislature was not a very bad bill. One can fancy Mr. Quay and the rest who hold the pardoning power addressing another Pittsburgh mob with this sort of argument. Bribery of the law-making power is one of the things about which civilized mankind long ago came to an agreement, yet there may be a difference of opinion as to the grade it occupies in the list of crimes—whether it is more or less nefarious than larceny, burglary, or arson. There can, however, be no difference of opinion concerning a community or country where bribery of the legislature is treated as an offence punishable only by fine. This is the unhappy plight in which Pennsylvania has been placed by her public authorities. Her courts are yet unsullied, which is, of course, an immense protection, but the same power which makes the Board of Pardons and the Executive makes the courts; and if it finds public opinion docile or torpid under this experiment, it will soon furnish courts of the Kemble pattern also—unless, indeed, the other side of society try their hand at making courts, and by virtue of numbers set up tribunals for the exclusive benefit of the poor man. If it should come to be understood or even suspected that the laws and their execution are for and against classes, cliques, and social divisions, the heterogeneous and unorganized masses will easily find Kearneys to pave the way to constitutions, legislatures, and courts constructed as strictly in their own interest as the Board of Pardons is now in the interest of "respectable" offenders.

#### THE SPECIFIC ARGUMENT AGAINST A THIRD TERM.

THERE are a good many reasons for fearing that the deep and widespread hostility to a third term, of which there are just now so many manifestations throughout the country, is turning, or is likely to turn, indirectly to the advantage of Mr. Blaine. He is, next to General Grant, undoubtedly the candidate most acceptable to the delegates who have been selected for the Chicago Convention by the machinery of the Republican party. There is much likelihood that, if the managers of the Grant "boom" should find it difficult or impossible to secure the nomination of their candidate, they will "transfer his strength," as the slang phrase is, to Blaine, as the only other candidate who comes near their ideal President.

He is already stronger in the Convention than any other candidate but Grant, and he will not need a great deal of "strength," in addition to what he has already, to make him the nominee. Indeed, we do not think it an exaggeration to say that to a large portion of the Republican voters who are just now opposed to Grant solely or mainly through their dislike of a third term, most of the arguments against a third term tell in Blaine's favor. In looking about for an alternative he presents himself to them as the most available of the persons to whom these arguments do not apply. His election would not be that "violation of the unwritten law of the Republic," or that "breach of the tradition of the Fathers," or "the dangerous precedent," of which they hear so much from those who are assailing Grant's candidacy. This is not by any means an unnatural view of the situation for those who hear little or nothing of any objections to General Grant except that he has already had two terms.

We confess, for our own part, that while fully appreciating the force of the argument that Grant ought not to have a third term because it is unwise to give any man a third term, we think it is very feeble indeed compared to the argument that the dangers of a third term are shown by its being claimed for this particular person. Frankly, we do not think that a tendency to give third terms to enlightened civilians who have proved their skill, efficiency, integrity, and judgment in their two previous terms would, of itself, be a very alarming phenomenon. A popular desire to retain for an indefinite period the services in high office of a statesman who had given abundant evidence of his capacity and purity and zeal for the public good, would not be a bad sign in a democracy like ours. In fact, there is perhaps nothing of which our politics just now stands in greater need. So that we do not, on the whole, rate very highly, *per se*, the abstract dictum that nobody should be president of a republic for more than eight years. It is only when we come to clothe it in circumstance and examine its application to a political system like ours, that the objections to it become apparent, and, little as we like to criticise the anti-third term movement, we cannot help saying that its promoters take too little pains to clothe it with circumstance. In other words, there can be no better illustration of the dangers of allowing the third-term doctrine to establish itself in our politics, than the fact that its benefits should be claimed with great boldness and persistence for a man whose two previous terms have been what General Grant's were. The most effective way by far of meeting the third-termers is by showing what their scheme means in practice. The very first time we hear of the proposed change in the settled usage of the Government, we are asked to make it, not for a master of the political art, who had already satisfied the country of his great capacity, but for a soldier who, suddenly placed in the Presidency in a burst of popular gratitude for great military services, amazed and pained the country during two terms by the scandals and disorders of his Administration, by the low character of the men by whom he surrounded himself, by his cultivated indifference to public opinion, and by the wreck which he brought on his own party. With this illustration the opposition to the third term may be made a great instrument of political purification, and may be used to drive all corrupt and incompetent candidates out of the arena. Without this illustration it touches no candidate, however worthless or objectionable, who has not already twice filled the Presidency; and any corrupt organization can not only cheerfully take part in it, but use it to further their own ends.

There is every reason, short of actual experience, for believing that Blaine's administration would in some particulars be as bad as Grant's, and in many others worse. He has given no more proof than Grant of the possession of administrative capacity. He has shown even less interest in or knowledge of any of the great political questions by which the country is now agitated. In fact, his mental grasp of any such questions seems to be far feeble than Grant's. There is in Grant's mind a certain rude and ponderous strength, which only needed a different sort of training to make it an instrument of considerable power for political purposes; while



Blaine's attention seems to be as volatile and superficial as a boy's. As far as regards purity of administration, it is to be said for Grant that he represents corruption *per alium*, which is bad enough, while Blaine would in all probability represent corruption *per se*, which is far worse. "The Grant crowd," as his following is called, were a very low, dishonest, and unsavory set, but they were clumsy, incautious, and coarse in their methods, and were easily found out. Blaine's surrounding would all but certainly be men of the same stamp, as regards dishonesty and as regards the character of their designs on the public treasury and service, but they would be very astute, ingenious, and wary, and, while doing even more mischief, would not contract open alliances with "whisky-thieves" or enter into conspiracies with burglars to break open safes in order to ruin a political enemy. We may be sure, too, that the opposition of Blaine's adherents to any of the schemes of reform, whether in administration or legislation, on which thoughtful men all over the country have set their hearts, and which every sinister interest dreads, would be as determined as, and more efficacious than, that which the "Old Set" and the "Senatorial Group" were able to offer under Grant. In fact, the Machine—using that term to designate all the instrumentalities by which political managers remove the government of the country from the influence of the private morality, the plain common-sense, and the nobler national aspirations and moods of the people—would, in all probability, be more potent under Blaine than under Grant.

For all these reasons we cannot help feeling that, although appeals to the conservative feeling of the people and to the teachings of history and to the German dread of military hero-worship are doubtless very effective, and may be sufficient to prevent Grant's nomination, an argument made up in this way does not cover ground enough. It will do nothing to satisfy those who see in every Presidential election a chance, however small, to raise politics to a higher level, and to improve the arts by which the great places in the public service are sought and won, and will not suffice to prevent a nomination which to most of them would not be one whit better than Grant's. It will have a far wider sweep, and be really much stronger, if it boldly declare that one of the greatest objections to a third term is to be found in the political career of the person for whom it is now demanded, and if it thoroughly exposes the character of the two terms of which repetition is now sought. That the man who filled these two terms, and closed them under a cloud of public reprobation, should be able so far to recover from the effects of this reprobation by three years of foreign travel as to be again presented by his followers for the same office; that he should be brought forward, too, as a savior from some great national danger without feeling the necessity of stating what the danger is, is surely enough to make it plain that, whatever may be said for third terms in the abstract, they are unsuited to our politics.

In making it plain in this way, too, we reach all other candidates who are open to every objection except the third-term objection. Indeed, we doubt much whether the Blaine nomination would not be much more obnoxious as a precedent than Grant's, for it would establish the doctrine that a damaged private reputation ought not to be a disqualification for any office, which is as new as the third-term doctrine, and has as little sanction from the practice of the Fathers or the example of Washington. The American Stump, much as it has been derided, has traditions, and very respectable ones, too, and one of them is that it is, in a Presidential canvass, at least, a place for the discussion of principles and policy, and not for the investigation of private character. A party which deliberately devotes it for five months to the work of examining charges of personal knavery and corruption will be guilty of introducing a shameful novelty.

#### MANNERS IN AMERICA.

MR. JOHN FISKE, in his lectures on American history the other day, reprehended in rather severe terms the very common practice of call-

ing such and such traits Celtic, or Norman, or Teutonic; and, though he good-naturedly admitted that it was a fascinating speculation to trace idiosyncrasies of temperament and character to their supposed origin and give them labels, he observed that it was in the teeth of facts and an instance of "loose thinking." National differences of this kind nowadays, he thought, amounted after all to no more than the difference between a man and his brother. Confident inaccuracy has always been the bane of the literature of science, and it is not surprising that the stricter sort of scientists should have manifested their sensitiveness concerning it by fixing upon "loose thinking" as a convenient shibboleth, with the fortunate result that there is probably less and less necessity for a loose use of the term. At the same time it cannot be denied that the development theory itself, of which Mr. Fiske is so distinguished an exponent, has been a wonderful stimulant of "fascinating speculation" of all sorts, and that its influence is felt in fields quite outside of those treated in cosmic philosophies. Indeed, it may be said to have so far got into literature as to have affected the thought of those who hold with the late M. Doudan that "the man who has no vague ideas is a fool." Ideas have an irresistible disposition to concern themselves with even these matters of ethnology and sociology jealously pre-empted by scientists, and a certain vagueness is perhaps the payment exacted for the illumination they occasionally create. At all events, we are confident that a lecture on American characteristics would form an acceptable supplement to Mr. Fiske's course on "America's Place in History," and that, however indeterminate he might find these, he would even be successful in tracing the parentage of many of them to a Teutonic ancestry, and in finding the causes of their variations in certain cross strains and in the unfailing resource of the scientist—circumstances.

One of these traits, at least, is so general as to be national, and so peculiar as to be unique. The attitude of Americans towards manners is essentially Anglo-Saxon, or perhaps, as Mr. Freeman would say, English, but it has an accentuation, not to say an exaggeration, which the absence of any substitute for traditional feudalism has permitted and fostered. Manners with us are more or less consciously regarded as a subtle compromise of character. The time has long passed when it was possible to identify the number of Americans at a foreign hotel by "counting the feet on the veranda-rail and dividing them by two," in spite of what we read in foreign papers of the demeanor of our travelling countrymen. Nevertheless, it can hardly yet be maintained that in the mass we illustrate elegance as eminently as we do more sterling qualities; and this is due not to the strictly material character of our civilization, perhaps, so much as to the rapidity of its growth and the necessity of attending first of all to the substantiality of the structure rather than the grace of the decoration of a new society. The American test of a casual stranger who very likely is going his way the next moment, is still, for example, not his civility but his sincerity. If his talk has a genuine ring and his behavior a genuine air about it, their acceptability is assured. Our code in this respect is still that of the mining-camp, though of a diluted intensity, of course; we somehow feel the same necessity of examining credentials in a New York drawing-room that is felt in Nevada: whether or no a man is a humbug is a question the better sort of people are irresistibly impelled to ask themselves immediately upon meeting him for the first time. How the correct answer can in the least matter to any one, or, in other words, what business it can be of anybody's, in any but a primitive community with no social police and dependent upon volunteer vigilance for its security, it occurs to no one to ask. Ordinary acquaintances are looked upon as candidates for close friendship: there is usually, of course, no intention or inclination to bring about a more intimate relation, but it may be said that in general a person must prove his worthiness to be a friend before he can become acceptable as an acquaintance. The artificial institution of a neutral ground upon which people meet impersonally, and where what is said and done is measured by an objective standard of its own, is wholly foreign if not repugnant to American notions of what manners should be. Doubtless it is a satisfaction to reflect that this attitude could not be unaffectedly assumed by any society that did not set a high value upon morals, and possibly there is a natural and inevitable connection between an elaborate development of manners and the vices of a polished society. At the same time it involves at least two results which have their disadvantages. One is a concentration upon the significance rather than the form of everything which attends social intercourse, and the other a paradoxical tendency to the very social hypocrisy which is popularly supposed to be the concomitant solely of the vicer of conventions. The first explains the prodigious amount of "horse-play" which,

though inherited from an Anglo-Saxon ancestry, has here been carried to a development and even a refinement elsewhere quite unknown. With no other people probably is rudeness so purely relative a thing; in taking no offence where none is meant, and conveying none in spite of every outward indication to the contrary, Americans display an unerring skillfulness which not only makes brusqueness perfectly innocuous, but often seems to imply the entire superfluity of the grammar of courtesy. If whatever inherent charm there may be in fine phrases is thereby sacrificed, there is recompense in the implicit confidence reposed in the *entente* presupposed, which is not unlike that of a large family—itsself proverbially “not a civil-spoken thing.” The social hypocrisy alluded to is not difficult of explanation. The feeling that character rather than manners is in question in social intercourse, is entertained just consciously enough to make this an intensely personal affair—a result powerfully contributed to by the extreme introspectiveness that distinguishes Americans. If it is a question of the personal impression one is producing, it is not in human nature to neglect making as good a showing as possible. One can understand from this the enquiry once made by an observant and candid Frenchman: “Why is it that Americans talk so much for effect?” The enquirer had no more experience of the moral tournaments so customary with us than his surprised auditor had of the possibilities of impersonal conversation in which the true “man of the world,” so sure of his own position, is such an adept.

This, however, can be made to apply only to Americans who do try to make something of social intercourse, and of course varies with the moral differences and the completeness of self-consciousness of the individuals who move in society. But, in general, manners are not viewed sympathetically by Americans of the finest fibre. Indeed, the quality of innate modesty, which is notoriously strong in Americans, has in it something inimical to manners. Whether or no its absence makes a “court gallant” what he is outwardly, it is not to be denied that in his presence the man of “natural politeness” in America can never avoid—outside of books—appearing either abashed or brusque. Any one who has observed the bearing of the rural New-Englander will remember—with delight, very likely—the almost childish shyness exhibited in the presence of unfamiliar conventions. The class which Mr. Howells celebrates as “summer boarders” must be rich in experiences of it. The Massachusetts rustic, in every mental and moral respect quite the equal of his “city-bred” acquaintance, displays an ineradicable animosity to what he calls “city airs.” Fathers are fond of mortifying their aspiring daughters by remarks in peculiarly aggravating circumstances about the frivolousness of napkins; these daughters, again, are overfond of inferring a “stuck-up” disposition in a city cousin guiltless of all offence beyond a well-fitting dress; rustic slang acquires a curious intensity in the presence of a grammarian. Every variety of protest, dogged and satirical, is made against what is called “style.” Boots go unblacked and hats without bands; shirts are patched with flour-bags; coats are taken off at meal-time; one “gallus” is worn instead of a pair, rope-yarn instead of shoe-laces; “be” is used for “am” and “are,” “hyarye” for “how do you do,” “hairin’ out” for “growing a beard”; “my wife” is “my woman”—wholly because of a defiant humility which insists that conventions are “airs,” and almost never out of ignorance. Indeed, there exists in rural New England, one may say, a social code of very strict sanctions and universally subscribed to, whose chief canon is the frivolousness of manners. And though nowhere else, perhaps, has it attained the same severity and distinct authority, the spirit which informs it is equally plain throughout the country, wherever it is not obscured by the refinement which the instinct of self-preservation tends to produce in the most exclusive society of three or four large cities. To the people everywhere Mr. Lowell’s line

“They knew that outward grace is dust,”

applies closely—notably to the people of “the unexhausted West,” whose characteristic unrestraint in the presence of conventions, and hearty disregard for anything that touches fastidiousness, have enriched our national vocabulary with a special sense of the adjective “Western.” Nowhere else do people wear the same outward suit on all occasions, and insist on the preservation of individuality in the most impersonal circumstances. The Western orator, preacher, editor, merchant insists on the same form for public and private conduct, with an emphasis eloquent of his conviction that any deference to what is understood by “manners” is at once a derogation from dignity and an assumption of “frills.” The respectable possibilities of this attitude never perhaps received a better exemplification than in Mr. Lincoln, whose “clear-grained human worth” and

“brave old wisdom of sincerity” are so finely celebrated in Mr. Lowell’s poem just quoted from.

“New birth of our new soil, the first American.”

undoubtedly Mr. Lincoln was, in the exactest logic; and the sympathetic recognition of this pre-eminence by the poet of broadest culture, perhaps, that the East can boast, making every allowance for the exigencies of commemoration odes, is strongly indicative of the universality of the American passion for simplicity, and impatience of anything artificial. Mr. Lincoln “always spoke of the Presidency as ‘this place,’” says a recent biographer of him, and nothing could be more characteristic of “the unexhausted West.” His distinction lay in the absoluteness of his simplicity and an extraordinary tact (apt to accompany such) which made it possible for him to transfigure homeliness on occasion—in the Gettysburg speech for example. Most statesmen who emulate his unaffectedness, it is well to bear in mind in the interests of precision, more or less nearly justify the remark of a Delaware journalist, to the effect that Americans like their public men to resemble base-burning stoves—“so that folks can sit around them and spit on them.”

This neglect of everything but the substance of things is admirably illustrated in the literature which burst into blossom a few years ago, and of which the stories of Bret Harte are, perhaps, the best examples. The theme of this was the real beauty of superficial uncouthness. It celebrated the diamond in the rough. Its popularity was instant and enormous, and it is quite erroneous to ascribe its success to the potency of the touch of nature it contained. Essentially it was flagrantly unnatural, and its scheme was not strictly to be called novel. The hollowness of social conventions had theretofore been pretty well exploited in Anglo-Saxon literature. Mr. Bret Harte’s distinction lay in the exaggeration of his contempt for these, and in the ease with which he “beat the record.” People cried over Kaintuck’s “The damned little cuss!” both because the cue of pathos was given so audibly, and because it was a covert protest against the habit of elegant speech. Primness, straitlacedness, pompous hypocrisy, unmeaning politeness, all seemed to be rebuked by it. It gave the conscientious an excellent excuse for unbending, and nothing is more American than an imperious inclination to unbend. Shocking the proprieties, indeed, is no small part, if one comes to think of it, of what is called American humor. It is very near the whole stock-in-trade of the newspaper paragrapher, who has lately appeared in such abundance; his constant occupation seems to be pulling the chair from beneath dignity. Very often this propensity is indulged without disguise and in complete consciousness, which any one may verify by observing the quality of the most successful “hits” in a popular American burlesque. The vulgarity does not appeal to the unconscious envy which creates the hilarity of a Cockney at a penny theatre in London, but to pure abandonment, which is as delightful to the orchestra as the gallery. But it is to be seen at its best and in its most unique aspect when it is mistaken by its possessors for “a return to nature.” Nothing is so agreeable to the true American as a vigorous protest against cant; and it is perhaps a necessity of the average American’s experience that he should make occasional mistakes about the nature of cant. Most ceremonial, from the use of finger-bowls to the ritual of the Episcopal Church, has first and last incurred this ill-repute in the minds of not a few whole-souled American devotees of “heartiness.” And not only ceremonial, but the ideas which underlie it, encounter sturdy hostility. Mr. Beecher, for example, who is so ardent a “naturalist” that he sometimes seems to admire in the civilized man only those traits which he shares with the barbarian, has even taken advantage of it, with the inspiration of genius, to make serious inroads upon the vogue of the Calvinist theology. What are canons, conventions, court decisions but clogs and impediments in the way of natural expression? he seems to cry every Sunday, suiting his action and tone to the word. And together with these musty artificialities dogma itself crumbles before the eyes of sympathetic hearers. The appeal of the Rev. Mr. Talmage is still more directly to the heart and conscience rather than to the taste. The taste of Mr. Talmage has, of course, little that is typical about it, but it is an exaggeration rather than a contradiction of the national tendency to esteem outward grace dust. American good sense may certainly be trusted to prevent the permanent survival of flagrant offences against taste, and only such observers as the writers for *Blackwood’s Magazine*, probably, see a necessary and intimate connection between manners and monarchy. But if republicanism with us is to continue to imply equality, it is as well to bear in mind that manners are, in a sort, the safeguard of social equality—which otherwise, indeed, might one day come to be found intolerable without them.



## FRENCH POPULARITY OF BEACONSFIELD.

PARIS, April 16, 1880.

THE result of the English elections has taken everybody by surprise in France. It was almost universally assumed that Lord Beaconsfield would triumph, and the victory of the Liberals seems hardly comprehensible. The feeling here is very different from that entertained at Berlin, Vienna, or St. Petersburg. We are witnesses more than actors in the diplomatic drama which is enacting in Europe, and none of our own plans is deranged by the English elections. Public opinion in France, though we are so near England, is always somewhat ignorant of the details of English affairs. It is satisfied with general impressions. There was certainly, if we examine these impressions with regard to the English Conservatives and Liberals, more sympathy felt in this country for the Conservatives than for the Liberals. The reasons for this preference are rather singular; the principal one is, perhaps, the great admiration which has always been felt here for M. Disraeli, as Lord Beaconsfield is still persistently called. The French admire in Disraeli the man who succeeded by the mere force of his character and his intelligence in conquering the leadership of the proudest aristocracy in the world. The defects which in England are constantly brought as reproaches against Lord Beaconsfield are unknown to the French, and, if known to them, would not affect them in the same way they do the somewhat morbid gentlemen of London, Oxford, or Cambridge. Disraeli is constantly accused of being theatrical; the French have no objection to theatrical men, they are grateful to a man who plays a good part and who plays it well. They admire the artist; they do not dislike simplicity, but they believe that simplicity may be the triumph of art. Some of M. Disraeli's sayings, the formulas and sententious phrases in which he delights to wrap up his ideas, have been much admired in France; such phrases as "peace with honor," which was uttered after the treaty of Berlin, on the return of Lord Beaconsfield from a long and tedious Congress, speak to the French imagination. There are many others which, at various periods, have been laid aside like political gems, and have given our public the idea that Disraeli was an "homme d'esprit"; and what higher praise can be bestowed on a man?

I remember well how infatuated Eugène Forcade, of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, was with Disraeli. The success of an "homme de lettres," a mere writer, consoled Forcade for all his own troubles. He often told me that the rise of Disraeli was the best proof that could be given of the vitality and cleverness of the British aristocracy; he often contrasted the position of the great leader of the Tories with the position which was occupied at the time in France by some of our best literary men. Forcade enjoyed every triumph of Disraeli as a sort of personal triumph; he took almost a child's pleasure in the success of his novels, in the noise he made in the world; he believed him to be one of the few men in Europe who are natural leaders of nations. I mention Forcade in this instance as he was a man of great culture, of great intelligence himself; he represented the large class of journalists, and his influence for many years was really considerable.

There is another reason for Lord Beaconsfield's popularity out of England: he has always been careful, during all his public life, not to say anything offensive to foreign nations; he who was so bitter, and who could be so unsparing at home, who was at one time a sort of political gladiator, has always assumed with regard to other races, nationalities, peoples, the cold, prudent, and frigid tone of diplomacy. No king, no potentate, no nation has in its side one of those poisoned arrows, "lancés d'une main sûre," by the hand of Lord Beaconsfield. While his party revelled in the most absurd and passionate accusations against the North, while some of the Liberal leaders offended America almost as much by their contemptuous sympathy as they would have done by their hostility, Disraeli kept silent. He has in him something of the sphinx; he never said one word which Mr. Seward at the time, or which Mr. Evarts now, could turn against him. Did he see further than his friends; had he a better knowledge of the latent forces hidden in the American Union; did he only obey a chivalrous impulse, or was his silence systematic—who knows? The consequence is certain. Mr. Disraeli has, with regard to all foreign Powers, an unassailable position; he has always fulfilled towards them the duties not only of neutrality but of courtesy.

France saw with complete indifference the late events in which Lord Beaconsfield took such a prominent part. The old jealousies between England and France in the East, in Egypt, in Syria, seem to be completely dead; we have, in fact, established in Egypt a sort of *condominium* since the downfall of the last Khedive. Diplomats of the old school were amazed at the indifference which the French public showed when Lord

Beaconsfield, by a stroke of imperial policy and before consulting Parliament, bought a large number of shares of the Suez Canal. With the joint-stock government of Egypt a new system has been established in the East: the financiers have more to do than the diplomats, and this new tendency has gone so far as to render France completely indifferent to the convention which gave Cyprus to England. The Conservative Government found France weakened, humbled, discontented with the Bonapartist policy of war and adventure, and it has reaped the benefit of this situation. Even among the most ardent supporters of the Republic there was no animosity felt against the English Tories, while Gambetta and his friends cherished a sort of rancorous feeling against the Liberals, who had done nothing for them in 1870. When M. Thiers made his journey round Europe in quest of an ally for France he had interviews in England with Lord Granville, and he sent his reports to the Government at Tours; his despatches will some day be published, but the conversations of M. Thiers were so frequent, so open, on the subject that there is little doubt that Lord Granville received the French envoy in a manner which did not give him any satisfaction. England was still under the influence of the publication in the *Times* of the famous Benedetti treaty concerning Belgium, and a real indignation was felt against Napoleon. The Government of National Defence was not considered in the light of a government with which it was safe to enter into any arrangement. M. Thiers himself did not disguise the fact that everything was uncertain in the future; he was terribly afraid of a Bonapartist restoration; he was very unfavorable to a royalist restoration, and he did not disguise it at any of the courts which he visited. He astonished the English Liberals, who had always looked upon him as a representative of constitutional monarchy; his language was obscure, inspired by personal feelings as well as by patriotic motives; it seemed at the time almost incomprehensible. It is not much to be wondered at if he found no "ouverture," no "opening" anywhere, to use a diplomatic expression. Still, the failure of M. Thiers caused much irritation in France among the men of the Government of the National Defence, and their irritation turned especially against the Liberals, who were then in power. Lord Granville thought it necessary during the late electoral battle to reassure the French Republicans with regard to his feelings towards France, and made a sort of half-apology for the coldness of the Liberals in 1870.

This precaution has not been quite vain, and the tone of the Republican press, which was almost hostile to the English Liberals, has become more moderate. There have been intimations made also in some quarters that the success of the Conservatives would have helped in a great measure the plans of the Austro-German alliance. This alliance of Berlin and Vienna, established since the journey of Prince Bismarck, is the great Continental fact which "dominates the situation" in Europe, if I may use a vulgar but expressive phrase. We are told in Berlin and in Vienna, not only by the Government organs but by the press of all shades and opinions, that this great German Bund will not be the combination of an hour; that it will last, that it has a mission to accomplish—a mysterious mission in some respects, an avowed mission in other respects. It will continue in the East the policy instituted by the Congress of Berlin—that is, will give Austria her due share of influence in the Balkan peninsula. What the mysterious mission of the "Kaiserbund" may be, we are left to judge; but it was a singular coincidence that at the time when this Kaiserbund was formed, the German press began to accuse Russia and France of secret designs, of common designs; Prince Gortchakoff was denounced to the world as the man who had told France "Make yourself strong," as if he wanted to use this returning strength of France as soon as possible. It seemed already as if a secret alliance had been made between Paris and St. Petersburg, and the Kaiserbund were really only a defensive counter-alliance.

The extreme disappointment felt in Vienna and Berlin has given many people in Europe the impression that the two German Kaisers expected, if not the active co-operation of Lord Beaconsfield, at least his sympathy for their plans, whatever these plans may be. An "entente cordiale," if not an alliance of London, Prussia, Vienna, would have made in the midst of Europe a barrier over which Russia and France could not have exchanged hands. The Liberals in England have prophesied to their electors that Lord Beaconsfield, if he was victorious, would embark them upon adventures much more dangerous than a war with Afghanistan or with Cetywayo; and it seems probable that the British electors have, in one sense, followed a conservative instinct when they pronounced themselves, as they have now done, for a policy which will be more strictly a policy of non-intervention. There can be no doubt that Europe will not perpetually feed four millions of men in arms and not

try what these four millions of men are worth. England very luckily and very cleverly played her part of first Power in the last Eastern question; she may well rest now for a while and meditate, asking herself what her duties may be in the future European questions which are slowly but surely preparing.

#### RELIGIOUS OPINION IN GERMANY.

LEIPZIG, April 1.

**D**URING the last decade, or since the last edition of Schwartz's well-known 'History of the Most Recent Theology,' published in 1869, Germany has undergone important changes in religious opinion, a brief glance at a few of which may not be uninteresting to the readers of the *Nation*.

Beginning with the radical side, Professor Zeller, of Berlin, the foremost teacher of historical philosophy, the son-in-law of F. C. Baur, and the reputed confidential religious adviser of the Crown Prince and Princess, has published a brilliantly-written, matured, and moderate digest of the writings of the Tübingen school.\* Into these essays he has incorporated his own well-known arguments, that the constitution of the Church was during the early Middle Ages modelled largely into analogy with the Platonic republic, and that the popular Stoic philosophy had much influence upon the development of its doctrines. He lays great stress upon the fact that the Tübingen movement, unlike English deism, French atheism, or German rationalism, was started by mature professors of theology and men of deep personal piety, and draws a picture of Baur's profoundly religious and pastoral character which all must admire, and which made his sermons edifying to all who heard them. Zeller urges that the Tübingen method, which consists simply in applying to the New-Testament writings the same canons of criticism that are applied to all other writings of antiquity, and which he would therefore designate simply as the *historical* method, does not, if rightly comprehended, undermine, but only strengthens, the foundations of piety; and he reminds us how the Emperor Julian feared that the classical literature would be discredited if faith in the old mythology were destroyed. The Tübingen investigations, though discredited by the extreme and injudicious writings of Strauss, Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer, etc., and for the time arrested by the death of Baur and by the orthodox reaction, have, we are assured, convinced every impartial scholar under forty five who has thoroughly studied them, and still point out the direction which religious studies must take if Protestant theology is to maintain a respectable place among the other departments of learning.

This movement is still very effective, along with the development of modern science, in inclining many of the most thoughtful and deeply religious to an outside position of indifference or of hostility to the creed and rites of the Lutheran Church, which, by universal consent, is steadily losing its hold upon the mental, moral, and social life of all the large German communities. Judged by the number of its churches, the growth of its religious organizations, or by the percentage of its church-going population, no large city in Christendom is so utterly indifferent to, and I had almost said unconscious of, the very existence of instituted Christianity as Berlin, and that in spite of the influence of the Kaiser's half of the court.

Again, the *Cultur* war, together with the May laws, by which the Established Church was required to submit to all the restrictions imposed on the Catholics, not only caused the distinctions between these and the Lutherans to be confused in the popular mind, and both to seem involved in a common condemnation, but it crushed the Döllinger movement, embittered, united, and won sympathy for the Catholics, and brought the Church to the condition of a mere vassal of the state, while the latter became absolute and supreme in a dangerous sense, even over the hitherto free domain of religious life and thought. It is now for the first time possible to be born, married, and to die outside of the pale of the Church. The Catholic priests, by scores and hundreds, have abandoned their parishes and let them "run wild" rather than conform to oppressive laws or pass the secular "cultus examination" which the Lutheran candidates for orders are required to do, who afterwards in their pulpits not unnaturally often abandon the old, edifying appeal to the *Gemüth*, and begin to preach philosophy, while the religious question and a Romish party have been introduced into politics. The efforts to make the schools confessionless have led to some curious results. The history of the Christian era and of the Reformation reads strangely when so written as to give no offence

to Catholics or to Jews, and many sad and curious incidents are told illustrating the impracticability of education on such a basis—teachers dismissed, good text-books mutilated or discarded for bad ones, parents watching and complaining of the tendencies of instruction, etc.

Professor Luthardt, probably the most influential of the conservative Lutheran leaders, has just closed an important and able series of public lectures, soon to appear in print, emphasizing these and other evil consequences of the May laws, but chiefly important as a defence, from the standpoint he represents, against anti-Christian influences in general. The chief of these, he says, is rationalism. The Middle Ages saw the perfection of corporate life. Men worked, played, fought, and worshipped in masses. The Reformation introduced the principle of subjectivity. Men wished to be certain of salvation each for himself without priestly mediation. Kant's affirmation of autonomy; Lessing's ultra-Protestantism against all authority; pietism, which makes the edification of the individual soul the chief thing; the "storm-and-stress" literature—all these are but caricatures of the teaching of Luther, and not progress beyond it. The rights and the sphere of the judgment of the *individual* as independent of the community, the *Zeitgeist*, the authority of the Church, etc., have thus been emphasized beyond all bounds, and to a degree inconsistent alike with daily observation (which teaches that sin is the greatest fact in the world) and with the doctrine of heredity, therapeutic art, legal experience, etc., and are in schools and through the press undermining the foundations of parental and magisterial discipline and authority. The third element of rationalism is the superstitious reverence of knowledge for its own sake, which results in *Aufklärung* and repugnance to all obscurity and mysticism. It is very doubtful whether education really makes people better, and it is false that the knowledge of virtue makes men virtuous. The broad and shallow curriculum of the schools encourages half-culture, discontent, and insubordination. The effects of rationalism came into the schools with Rousseau's 'Émile,' which Voltaire well characterized as inclining all who read it to desire to get down, brute fashion, on all fours; and the school even now seems likely to supersede the Church. Children are too tenderly educated, and allowed far too much moral freedom. Rationalism, too, brought universal suffrage and a consequent immense waste of mental, moral, and material energy in political manoeuvring and party squabbles, until now, especially in America, politics is a school of corruption, where young men learn that the chief virtue is cunning knavery that escapes being found out. Business life, also, is a war of the strong against the weak, and introduced the Jewish method of showy and undurable cheapness, while competition has destroyed values. The theatres corrupt taste and morals; the beer-houses, which have doubled in number within ten years in each German *Dorf*, injure family life and "demoralize our effeminate youth." Work is specialized and therefore degraded, so that men cannot be complete in their vocation, but seek compensation in sensuous enjoyment, and the statistics of crimes of animal indulgence have rapidly increased. Men are not satisfied to do their duty and be respectable, useful members of society, but long for public spheres of activity; and worst of all, he adds, in America they even want women to vote. Thus the motto, *laissez-faire laissez-aller*, is as dangerous as the assumption that all men are free and equal is false. Equality has destroyed and always does and will destroy freedom, and the tyranny thus caused is the most ghastly because it blights all moral and intellectual life. All these evils which, from Luthardt's standpoint, have befallen modern society, are directly or indirectly traceable to rationalism.

As the second great source of danger to the Church he designates pantheism, which underlies most German philosophy and which has now found expression in the notion of the state as absolute. From the conception that the bottom principle of the world is an impersonal, changeless or ever-unfolding, system of forces, toward which our only feeling can be either that of absolute dependence or of æsthetic complacency in all its manifestations, eventuating in the "religion of taste," Luthardt describes the logical and the historical transition (begun with Hegel's philosophy of the state, but bearing practical fruit only during the last two decades) to the ideas which have now come to animate the German Empire—viz., that the united wisdom of the most learned men must be an absolute if not infallible *logos*, subordinating and governing church, school, justice, trade, warfare, etc., with supreme might and right.

Materialism is the third and last anti-Christian influence. It arises now, as it did among Jews, Greeks, and Romans, at the close of a long period of culture, and is not a philosophy, but marks the end of all philosophy. It teaches that there is no responsibility and no punishment; that to know all is to forgive all; that sin and crime are a disease. It is

\* 'Vorträge und Abhandlungen' Von E. Zeller. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1875. 77.



monistic, Darwinistic, Socialistic. Its theories, as elaborated in Marx and Lassalle, are cosmopolitan as opposed to rational. The individual is encouraged to give up all his rights to society, and to receive pay in pleasure and enjoyment. It views life from a day-laborer's standpoint, and measures work only by the hour. Socialism is atheism taken in earnest. It is God's punishment upon society for the sins of the wealthy classes. Acquisition, enjoyment, sensuousness have brought us to a time when men must, as Pascal said, either believe or despair. Pessimism, the latter alternative, is the choice of those who find faith impossible, and is a proof that earthly goods and pleasure do not satisfy. In his concluding lecture Luthardt depicted pessimism on the one hand and Christianity on the other, and urged that the choice for all men lies between the two.

The young men who enter the Lutheran ministry may be roughly divided into two classes: first, those from respectable families, well bred, of good figure, voice, feature, excellent social and domestic qualities, and considerable tact in keeping clear of all sorts of trouble, but without deep convictions, great scholarship, or much initiative power. Secondly, students from the country, who are often pietistic and often indifferent, but are drawn into the theological lecture-rooms from various obvious associations, because other interests are unawakened, or because, so far as they have observed, a preacher's life is on the whole more desirable than that of a teacher. Very many, after a year or more, abandon the theological for some other faculty, and I have even heard it said jestingly that study under the former had come to seem almost like a preparatory stage for medicine, philology, and jurisprudence. For students of limited means, who reach or pass the clerical examination before finding their mistake, the results are sometimes scarcely less than tragic. The chief theological *Verein*, despite its beery conviviality, is pietistic in a forced and almost mediæval sense. The complaint that the right sort of young men for the pulpits, and especially for the theological professorships, are not to be found, while in other departments they are pressing the older men aside prematurely, is often made by the religious press. Certain it is that many of the young docents, whose specialty is Semitic philology, or Hebrew archaeology, or Church history, or diplomacy, have no deep interest in, or little knowledge of, the distinctively Christian doctrines, and probably for that very reason are inclined by the instincts of discipline, fear, or loyalty to their faculty to emphasize, often absurdly, the external forms of creed and practice, in order to cover the lack of a living faith. This, and the alienation of the more liberal-minded, together with the gross and tasteless religious nihilism of the Social-Democratic brochures and lectures, have sapped the "mediating theology" of Dörner, etc., which was so influential and promising ten years ago, and have caused the conservative lines to be drawn in many respects closer than for many decades here. This is the oft-instanced orthodox reaction in Germany. While losing its hold upon the community and rejecting the best elements of faith, and making it impossible for men of deep thought and earnest purpose to enter or gain influence in its ranks, and breaking with modern progress, it has unquestionably become better disciplined within, and more assured and confident in its utterances.

The Lutheran Church is homely and old-fashioned in its rites and services, has never been very successful with Sunday-schools or charities, is suspicious of revival work, has almost no popular or juvenile literature, and, in short, so far as the means of active aggressive work are concerned, is comparatively helpless. The recent Christian-Socialistic movement of Pastor Todt, which, starting from the assumption that Christianity and Socialism had points of sympathy in that both were at bottom a protest against an existing order of things, attempted to organize penny-saving societies in the schools, and to instruct workingmen, and by such means to prove "the existence of undeveloped elements of regenerating power in Christianity," has not been a success. Meanwhile some of the older members of the Church, who share the standpoint of the Protestant *Verein*, have wandered far away from the common standard. The dogmatic systems of Professors Biedermann, of Zürich, and Pfleiderer, of Berlin, both published, I think, in 1869, fall just before the period we are contemplating, and are scholarly and systematic presentations of Christian doctrines from a standpoint not essentially differing from that of radical Unitarianism. The works of Ritschl\* and Lipsius,† however, fall within the last decade. The former neglects the metaphysical elements of the divine nature, but deduces all from the moral character of Jesus. Not God, he says, but man is atoned. The kingdom of God has

unfortunately little to do with the Church. Christianity is simply a generic way of looking at the world, and regarding neither individuals nor communities. Jesus' influence is more abiding than that of other great men because it is purely moral. So too with the more psychological Lipsius: Christianity is a purely "natural process of a higher order." We have no space here to epitomize these important hand-books. In fact, able and interesting as they are, they contain little radically new to the student of religious philosophy; but, bearing in mind that religious opinions are learned not by argumentation but, as we learn to spell, by long-continued reiterations, it is not surprising to know that their influence has been great.

In regard to the date of the Gospels and the authenticity of John—questions still of the liveliest interest—very little new has been evolved by the voluminous discussions of the last ten years. There have been constant and unquestioned, though on the whole not very great or general, concessions to the mythic hypothesis in the New, and especially in the Old Testament criticism, and to the tendency-theory in the New Testament and the arguments for a late date of certain of the contested books of the latter, while new and promising conceptions of the constitution of the early Christian communities have been developed. This all too brief and imperfect sketch should not close without mention of a tendency represented, though as yet not very numerous, by young men of theological training, who insist that, despite their conviction of the truth of the extreme Tübingen and scientific methods, they yet have a right to a place in the Church. They profess to see a profound psychological meaning in the atonement, Trinity, etc.; a matchless didactic method in the doctrines of inspiration, the deity of Christ, and eternal punishment; a moral and æsthetic cultus in the rites and material equipment of the Church, and an incomparable instrument of discipline and social order in its organization; and urge that therefore they have a place in its ranks and a right to assert its doctrines far superior to that of the ordinary clergyman or lay member who has no such insight, and whom they do not scruple to charge with Phariseism. Whether this movement have life enough in it to bring it to any successful practical issue, remains to be seen; but it is in this spirit and direction that the greatest religious reforms have been wrought out. Its ethical enthusiasm is of the purest and strongest kind, and it alone makes the near religious future of Germany hopeful or interesting.

## Correspondence.

### THE OPPOSITION TO GENERAL GRANT AND THE OPPOSITION TO MR. BLAINE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There is one thing sure to hold back the managers at Chicago, even if they have all the delegates in their own hands—the certainty that the people will not elect their man. Senator Conkling alone is suspected of such self-forgetful devotion to ideal principle—the abstract theory of boss-ship—as to be willing, like Casabianca, to go down with the ship rather than desert his silent Sire. The others, at least, are "practical" men who have no mind for paper victories.

Of the opposition, some at least of the politicians who are "outs" would wheel into line; but the remainder constitute an immense body of determined Republicans, the most of whom absolutely will not vote for General Grant. The resolution to this effect was tabled at the recent Albany conference not because it did not represent the personal determination of most of those present, but because that conference did not seem to the majority to be the occasion to say by resolution what is being said even more strongly by individuals and in acts every day. Independence has got beyond talking before conventions and doing nothing after, and the loyal Republicans can be counted by the hundred thousands who propose to disown the nominee of the Convention in case the Convention disowns them. There is nothing so certain in American politics as that the selection of General Grant would lead at once, especially in the case of Mr. Tilden's nomination, to the presentation of a Republican third candidate for a conscience vote.

The opposition to Mr. Blaine, though obscured for the time by the whirlwind of protest against General Grant and the third term, as the more threatening evil, is not less determined and has even stronger grounds. Mr. Blaine, with the evidence against him still fresh, was typically the objectionable candidate of 1876. He is not less so now. The objections against him are threefold: (1) Mr. Blaine is not a statesman or leader, but a politician and demagogue. He not only fails to represent

\* Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 3 vols. Bonn, 1870-74.

† Lehrbuch der Evangelischen Protestantischen Dogmatik. Braunschweig 1876.

great principles or measures, but does represent the contraries to the Republican principles of 1876—sectionalism and not union, a new deal of spoils and not administrative reform, a view of human rights paralleled only in the pro-slavery utterances of '52. (2) Mr. Blaine is, if no worse, a commercial adventurer by his own confession, a speculator or "broker" in railroad stocks which had been or were to be subjects of legislation in Congress. His nomination for the Presidency would be the culmination of the speculation which is the curse of these times and has especially been the curse of this country since the war, and it would offer to younger Americans the worst possible example of what kind of services this country proposes to reward. (3) Mr. Blaine is believed, further, by those who have most fully looked up the facts, to be personally dishonest and corrupt, an objection made only against him and against Mr. Tilden, but to many the strongest of all possible objections. The contradictions between his own letters and "personal explanations," and the remarkable testimony brought out in the half-finished investigations which prostrated him physically and broke him down as a candidate in 1876, are for the time overlooked; it is almost forgotten that there is evidence against him. As a matter of fact, many a criminal has been "sent up" on less, and few business men would care to give a place of trust in their own counting-room to a man with the record of this candidate for the headship of the nation.

All this would make little difference to the managers unless it threatened to lose votes. But this is what it will do; and the *Tribune* is right in saying that "the party cannot afford the risk of driving even a handful of voters over to the Democrats," especially when in most "Republican" States the party is in a minority on the total vote, and in such as Ohio and New Hampshire has a margin of but one-half of one per cent. This, after nearly five per cent. of the Republicans voting in "the pivotal State" had "scratched" a candidate personally less objectionable than Mr. Blaine.

A candidate for the Presidency is not a light under a bushel, and Mr. Blaine's judicious protest against personal attack on candidates cannot eliminate from the canvass so pertinent a question as to whether or not a would-be President is personally dishonest. Mr. Blaine's nomination might not, probably would not, lead to the wholesale Republican bolt certain to follow that of General Grant, but it will produce a dry-rot within the party yet more dangerous to it. The men whom Mr. Blaine will repel will be repelled after his nomination rather than before, and this is the danger to the party. "He appealed to their imagination," says the *Tribune* of the leader of Jingoism abroad, "but was condemned by their judgment and reason." I think the politicians would be surprised, in the event of Mr. Blaine's nomination, by a wave of honest indignation such as has just swept over redeemed England. There is a rapid increase in the number of American voters who are resolute that parties shall mean something in this country, and who will be bold to antagonize even their own party if it presents only a choice of evils. The Young Republicans of Massachusetts, the Republican League of Pennsylvania, and the Independent Republicans of New York stand on a positive platform of principles which have already been applied, directly or indirectly, to the exclusion both of Grant and Blaine. It is necessary that this application shall be made. The "choice of evils" is just what the fight is against, and those men are not "irreconcilables" who, as between Lucifer and Mephistopheles, will have none of either. The cry of "anything to beat Grant" has for the time subordinated the objections to Blaine, while, on the other hand, the fear that "all roads out of the Blaine camp lead to Grant's" gives pause to those who think there are worse dangers to political morality than the third term. This is the old dilemma that the politicians always contrive; the only way out is an aggressive resistance to both. I make bold to say that there will continue to be such a resistance—an organized and determined resistance—after as before the Convention, in the case of Mr. Blaine as in the case of General Grant. The policy of such a resistance, I think it may be said, will be to emphasize at the same time the importance of electing a Republican House, that a Democratic President may be supported in patriotic but not in partisan measures. This policy would more probably be successful under a strong Grant bolt than with a Blaine dry-rot. But it is time to insist on "heroic remedies," and the events of the past three months have not convinced those who originated the "scratching" against Mr. Cornell that they then made a mistake. When the chief office of the nation is in question, certain qualifications must be the more strongly insisted on, in the belief that when worst comes to worst only defeat can save the party.

R. R. BOWKER.

NEW YORK April 24.

## Notes.

THE copartnership of Houghton, Osgood & Co has been terminated by the retirement of Mr. Osgood, who becomes the head of a new firm, J. R. Osgood & Co., devoted to the heliotype business, and retaining chiefly the publication of the *American Architect* and of Mr. Sweetser's excellent guide-books. The new firm of Houghton, Mifflin & Co. bears for the first time the name of one who has long been a junior partner, we believe, and includes Mr. Lawson Valentine of this city. Among its first publications will be 'Ballads and Lyrics,' selected by Henry Cabot Lodge, editor of the *International Review*; a very full collection, primarily designed for school use.—'A Short Life of Charles Dickens, with Selections from his Letters,' by Charles H. Jones, is the latest of the Appletons' Handy Volumes; and if there be any demand for a colorless and creditable condensation of the copious biographical and already published concerning Dickens, this book is calculated to meet it, so far as we can judge. We observe that Mr. Jones is at no pains to idealize his subject.—Though holding no longer the rank of leading works in their sphere—superseded as they are in part by the bolder criticism of Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others—the writings of Ewald are still justly reckoned among the foremost productions of German historico-critical research; and of his numerous books the 'Antiquities of Israel,' a supplement to his 'History of Israel,' is one of the most valuable. An edition of the 'Antiquities' has just been imported by A. D. F. Randolph & Co.—In the *American Art Review* for April Mr. Linton continues his 'History of Wood Engraving in America,' the chief biographical sketch being of Joseph Alexander Adams, upon whom very high praise is bestowed. The leading etching of the number is Mrs. Anna Lea Merritt's portrait of Sir Gilbert Scott, after G. Richmond. It is, though not the best specimen of this artist's work with the needle, marked by characteristic vigor and decision. A brief account of our countrywoman is given by the editor.—The April number of the *Magazine of American History* contains three excellent leading papers—the first, a valuable digest of the recorded history of the Pawnee Indians, by John B. Dunbar. A sketch of the life of a meritorious Revolutionary officer, Col. Return Jonathan Meigs, by Henry P. Johnston, is accompanied by an etched portrait. Numerous fac-similes of maps found with a diary of an aide of Rochambeau's are given in connection with the translation which has been running through several numbers of the magazine. They are said to be tracings from contemporary army maps.—In No. 13 of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* will be found an interesting paper by Samuel W. Pennypacker, on the "Settlement of Germantown, and the Causes which led to it." The writer concludes, from a survey of the first twenty years, that the settlers were substantially a "people from the lower Rhine regions of Germany and from Holland," and in the main the offspring of the Mennonites.—In the 'Virginians' Thackeray mentions a certain French duke and marquis "who . . . accompanied Rochambeau . . . to the American coast," whose memoirs "the gentle reader" is specially warned not to consult. A new and most dainty edition of these 'Mémoires du Duc de Lauzun' has just been published in Paris by M. Rouveyre, whom we have to thank for other literary delicacies. M. d'Heylli contributes an introduction of forty-six pages, pointing out that this is one of the few unabridged editions, and carrying on the story of the author's life to his death by the guillotine. The etched head and tail-pieces to this introduction suit the Duke's French adventures better than his American exploits. M. Rouveyre has given us here a beautiful specimen of appropriate book-making.—We have received from F. W. Christern a specimen number of a new work in folio, 'Les Chefs d'Œuvre d'Art au Luxembourg,' of which the Librairie d'Art of Ludovic Baschet at Paris has just begun the publication. It contains a poem, "Au Jardin du Luxembourg," by François Coppée; a biographical and critical sketch of the painter Bouguereau, accompanied by wood-cuts of the subject and several of his sketches and a Goupil photogravure of his "La Vierge Consolatrice"; two drawings of the Luxembourg gardens, and an inflated rhetorical prospectus by the publisher. In every mechanical respect the forty *livraisons* which will complete the work will doubtless be as sumptuous, and in critical worth of as little moment perhaps, as the specimen number before us.—Another publication of great elegance is MM. Marius Michel's 'History of Bookbinding in France,' of which Mr. J. W. Bouton is the American agent.—Deanver's 'Catalogue of Works in Refutation of Methodism' has been largely expanded by MS. additions in four copies deposited in the libraries of the Andover (Mass.) Theological Seminary, the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., the Astor



Library, and the British Museum.—A 'Life of Arthur John Roebuck' and 'Soldiers of the Victorian Age,' by Mr. C. R. Low, are English works announced as in press.—We notice that Mr. Charles Waldstein, a graduate of Columbia College in 1854 (Ph.D., Heidelberg), is giving a course of lectures on the history of Greek sculpture in the lecture-room of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, England.

—The Harvard Natural History Society offers its third annual series of prizes for essays to be sent before Nov. 15, 1880, to Mr. Wm. M. Davis, Secretary, Cambridge, Mass. The writers must be "students, of either sex, who enter, attend, or graduate from public or private schools" during the present year, and must forward their essays anonymously, certifying in a sealed envelope to their identity and good faith. The topics are: (1) Dissemination of seeds; (2) "Make a collection of the plants of one family, and note the peculiarities of station of each plant"; (3) Characters of insect sub-orders; (4) The flight and other movements of birds; (5) Anatomy of any common animal; (6) A microscopical study of the inter-cellular spaces of our larger water-plants; (7) "An open question"—i.e., of the writer's own selection, approved by a committee consisting of Robert W. Greenleaf, Frederic Gardner, jr., and W. M. Davis; who will also furnish on application fuller particulars than we can publish. The prizes are \$25, \$20, and 10, to be awarded in January, 1881.

—A little primer on 'English Composition,' in the series published by Macmillan, and edited by Mr. J. R. Green, is the work of Prof. John Nichol, of the University of Glasgow. It was elaborately reviewed for the London *Statesman*, and in 'Doctor Indoctus,' just issued by Trübner & Co., we have the review "reprinted with additions and emendations." The initials attached to the preface are unnecessary to any one familiar with the scholarship and writings of Dr. Fitzedward Hall. Dr. Hall shows in the most lavish manner Prof. Nichol's incompetence for his undertaking, and fairly buries him beneath examples of the falsity of the rules laid down in the Primer, and of the professor's constant violation of them. Usually, in the case of those arbiters of style whom Dr. Hall from time to time takes in hand we quickly experience a pity for the object of his castigation, and there is room for it here, though the offence is flagrant. In particular, when the professor sins against his own canons, his wounds are apt to be washed with salt and water by abundant citations from standard writers which prove him to have been using good English in spite of himself. These citations, both in his support and for his confusion, give the pamphlet a value which neither mere polemics nor hypercriticism possesses. Every reader may profit for instance, from the notes in which the coupling of the singular verb with a conjunctively plural subject is discussed, or those in which the difference between the relatives *that* and *which* is examined; and we might mention many more. We recommend to teachers, writers, and proof-readers, and generally to purists however classed, the careful perusal of Dr. Hall's 63 pages. If Scotchmen, it is only fair to warn them that his well-known intolerance of Mr. Carlyle is based on racial as well as personal considerations. In passing, too, we observe that Dr. Hall lends the sanction of his high authority to a locution which, though often condemned, could long ago appeal to respectable usage on both sides of the water, when he writes, on p. 58, "since he *claims to sit* in judgment on the expression."

—Among the errors and omissions of English lexicographers is now to be classed a careless if not contemptuous neglect—to call it by no harsher term—of Roman Catholic technical nomenclature. Indeed, we should be justified in assuming from a paper in the current number of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* that there were traces of a conspiracy to suppress all information upon this subject, among those respectable scholars whom Dr. Johnson in his own dictionary defined as "harmless drudges." This it seems was undoubtedly the case immediately after the Reformation, and even when some Catholic terms "began to creep into dictionaries" they were defined in a way which, as the writer says, was "an insult to us or an insult to common sense"; not only was this true, but "every odious nickname and term of opprobrium that the filthiest hearts could engender" boldly stalked into these works. There was no excuse for the exclusion on the ground of novelty, it is explained. The terms "have been uninterruptedly used in the castle homes of the most ancient of the noble families of the three kingdoms," and "in the homes of sturdy yeomen and peasantry too brave and incorruptible to barter their faith for monarch's frown or parliamentary bribe." Moreover, the Catholic vocabulary is more "interwoven in the language" than that of any denomination, having grown up with the English tongue "when the Church, engaged in its civilizing work, transformed Saxon and Norman into one people by the unity of faith." Just now is a fitting

time to divulge all these things, "because the most pretentious dictionary ever yet prepared is soon to go to press"—meaning, of course, that of the Philological Society of Great Britain. There are indications, it appears, that the gentlemen who have this work in hand are not doing their duty by Catholics, and it is already a question whether they will not, therefore, "merely add one more to the list of absurdities." The article is in its details both elaborate and precise, and apparently its grievance is to some extent sound; its temper is not distinctly persuasive, but to lexicographers, of course, this matters less than its statements of fact. If, however, the writer's "pessimist forecast proves fallacious," as he says, in regard to the Philological Society's work, it should be borne in mind that Catholics of the present day have an ever-present refuge in what is here called "a hearty laugh" at Protestant blundering, and are no longer invited to "barter their faith for a monarch's frown." And in any event since the terms referred to are used "on the arid plains of inland Australia, through the well-watered republic of America, in England's fairest lands, and the green fields of Ireland," there should be demand enough for a *bona-fide* Catholic lexicon of the English language, if that of the Philological Society proves as treacherously incomplete or misleading as its less pretentious predecessors.

—Mr. Albert Stickney, whose recently-published 'A True Republic' displayed a marked tendency to political speculation of a more radical sort than is generally indulged in by American writers, contributes a paper on "Government Machinery" to the May number of the *International Review* which leaves a similar impression. The evils which he finds in our present system of managing public affairs are familiar, though Mr. Stickney's presentation of them is unusually pointed and comprehensive at the same time. He does not mind saying that we entirely pervert the true function of popular elections, which is "the mere selection of the few men who are to be at the head of our affairs." The great trouble being to get officials who will attend strictly to their duties, what we need is "a machinery for putting men out, not for putting men in." "Instead of continually using the process of election, we should simply hold in *suspense* the process of removal." This would at once fix responsibility, and would naturally concentrate an office-holder's attention upon his official functions rather than on schemes for re-election. If this plan should prove impracticable, and if the people, after the destruction of the present powerful party organizations, cannot be trusted to choose proper representatives, "then," says Mr. Stickney, "we must give up free government." There is no difficulty about finding good men, he is sure; the present holders of public office would be good enough "under a decent system." If Mr. Sherman, Mr. Blaine, and Mr. Conkling could be released to-day from "their grinding slavery to the election machine," we should have within five years the "finest civil service on the face of the earth." If anybody cries centralization, Mr. Stickney says it is the order of nature wherever affairs are vast; centralization of power being inevitable, centralization of responsibility is demanded as a safeguard. A certain puerility, illustrated in such statements as that "Mr. John Sherman four years since knew no more about finance than he did about Sanskrit," is possibly inimical to persuasiveness, but it does not operate to obscure Mr. Stickney's meaning or make it less suggestive.

—A staunch Republican writes us from South Carolina, where he has been travelling lately:

"I attended a Republican county convention here a few days ago. All the delegates were negroes. A white man, a Collector of Internal Revenue, I believe, came from a distance of eighty miles to address the meeting. He made a pretty effective speech—at least it would have been considered such where I live—dwelling on the tissue-ballots and vote-stuffing practices which are said to prevail here. The audience received his narrative with repeated bursts of laughter. Not the least trace of moral indignation or sense of injury could be perceived in the assemblage. On the contrary, the tissue-ballots were regarded as a huge joke and a screaming farce, and the orator was congratulated by his listeners as the funniest man that had ever been heard in that region, and he was urged to come again and tell them some more good stories. I was shown by the orator a list of the white Republicans of South Carolina; the number was two hundred, and the list was believed to be complete."

—A correspondent, just returned from Honolulu, writes us as follows from St. Louis, under date of April 19, 1880:

"The Hawaiian reciprocity treaty has done wonders for the islands, and in three years has developed resources which would otherwise have lain dormant for decades. Almost all the merchandise used there is American, and the business interests are mainly in the hands of Americans, whose energy and capital are producing such good results. Some fear abrogation of the treaty through the influence of the New Orleans and New York refiners. The former surely have no just cause of com-

plaint, as the sugars are entirely different, and the New York refiners have but experienced a somewhat earlier cessation of the California trade than would inevitably have resulted from the numerous refineries and the amount of capital invested in them on the Pacific coast. The charge of importing Manila sugars *via* the islands is almost too ludicrous for consideration, as, first, there has been no vessel from Manila to the islands for years (statistics prove this), and, secondly, the Honolulu merchants and planters are far too wide-awake to permit such an injury to their own vital interests. The Chinese question on the islands is somewhat serious, since they appear to be crowding the natives out; but as they intermarry freely and are somewhat amenable to the native customs and habits, the admixture may prove a beneficial one, and as yet the Portuguese immigration and that from the neighboring isles keep them in check."

—"A Child of the State," now having a very successful run at "Wallack's," is a specimen of that "old-fashioned melodrama" which M. d'Ennery knows so well how to turn out. "A Child of the State" appears designed to illustrate the social dangers of severe penal legislation on the subject of the relation of the sexes. The law-givers of Holland, it seems, enacted two or three centuries since a Draconian statute with regard to the parents of children born out of wedlock. We cannot give all the details, but to judge by M. d'Ennery's play its violation involved on the part of the father a choice between the two evils of death and matrimony. There were other provisions which complicated the simplicity of the law, and, of course, in a melodrama of the *Porte St. Martin* variety the terrible alternative is only presented for the purpose of deepening the gloom which through the first four acts threatens to engulf the virtuous characters of the play. It would be idle to attempt to give any analysis of the plot. There is a young count of the old *De Lancy* family (Mr. Maurice Barrymore) madly in love with *Marie* (Miss Marion Booth), the ward of the excellent *Frederich von Helmich*, chief magistrate of the Hague (Mr. John Gilbert), and his wife *Louise* (Miss Rosa Rand). *Christian* (Mr. Gerald Eyre) is an advocate, who, like all the advocates of French melodrama, carries about with him a folio edition of the Code. *Heinrich* (Mr. Harry Edwards) is *Christian's* uncle, and also the middle-aged villain of the play. He it is who is really the father of *Gertrude*, the child of the state (Miss Emily Rigl), and who threatens the unfortunate mother of his child with exposure unless she consents to a marriage between *Christian* and *Marie*. He it is who involves the count *De Lancy* in all sorts of trouble, which threatens to end only with an ignominious death. He it is, too, who, after his nephew *Christian* has been run through the heart by his rival (as he justly deserved), and all his villainous schemes are seen to be thwarted on the eve of success, is finally himself exposed and ruined through the clever management of *Gros René* (Mr. Wallack), the young count's friend and adviser. All the acting is very good, and Miss Rigl shows a good deal of tragic power in the part of *Gertrude*. The third act, in which the fatal duel takes place, is as good as any melodramatic acting we have seen here since *Fechter*.

—In the domain of the literature of the sagas the last few months have witnessed the appearance of several works of interest to Old-Northern scholars. Dr. Hugo Gering, of Halle, has now published his expected critical edition of the *Finnboga Saga*—relating to the North of Iceland—preceded by an admirable introduction and accompanied by a glossary; and has followed this by an equally excellent text of the *Ölkofra Tháttr* (Halle, 1890), a curious narrative of an early Icelandic legal process. Dr. Petersén has issued in Lund, Sweden, a really good edition of the important *Jónsvíkinga Saga*, which follows the text (No. 510) of the Arna-Magnæan Collection, thus differing from previous editions. It is notable, in reference to this old Icelandic picture of the age of the vikings, that the distinguished Icelandic scholar Arngrímur Jónsson (b. 1567, d. 1648) made a Latin paraphrase of it, using, as has been maintained by some, a more perfect MS. than any now existing. This early paraphrase, which seems to supply some lost incidents, has now been published by Dr. Gjessing, of Christiania. The text of the new edition of the famous *Njáls Saga* by Professor Konrad Gislason, of Copenhagen, has been for some time before the public. The editor is now engaged upon a volume of commentary, of which the first part, which is really an essay upon the skaldic metrical system, has already appeared. Of the greatest importance in saga literature is a singularly acute treatise, 'Ueber die Kristni-Saga' (München, 1878), by Dr. Oskar Brenner, a pupil of the well-known Professor Konrad Maurer. The author shows, by most careful investigations, that the *Kristni Saga* is really a part of the greater *Islandingabók* of Ari the Learned, which has heretofore been regarded as lost. It is the continuation by the historian Ari of his *Landnámabók*—that wonderful work which gives in such detail the story of the "Pilgrim Fathers" of Iceland. As a mere critical study Dr. Brenner's

book is worth reading even by those not specially interested in his theme.

—Translations of the sagas into the modern tongues are growing in number. A. U. Baath, the most promising of Sweden's younger poets, has given his countrymen an exceedingly good version of the *Njála*, while a German translation by H. Lefolli has been received with deserved praise. Two separate versions of the *Gunnlaugs Saga*, another of the *Fridthjofs Saga*, and another of the *Hávarðar Saga* have lately appeared in Germany. In another department of saga literature—that of the romantic sagas derived from southern sources—should be mentioned two editions of the *Tristrams Saga*, both showing high scholarship. The first is by that excellent native Icelandic scholar Dr. Gísli Brynjúlfsson, and is published by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries of Copenhagen. The other is by Dr. Eugen Kölbing, of Breslau, editor of the *Englische Studien*. The latter is entitled 'Die nordische und die englische Version der Tristram-Sage'; the first volume, containing the Icelandic text, a German rendering, and a full commentary, was published about a year ago, while the second, comprising the Old-English 'Sir Tristrem,' appeared more recently. That active laborer in the same field, Dr. Gustaf Cederschiöld, of the University of Lund, has edited, under the general title of 'Fornsögur Sudrlanda' (ancient sagas of the southern lands), the *Magus*, *Konráds*, *Bærings*, and *Flovents sagas*; and has since issued the *Clarus Saga* in both Icelandic and Latin. A work indispensable to every student of those sagas, the scenes of which are laid in Iceland, is the Danish 'Historisk topografisk Beskrivelse af Island' by K. Kaiund, in two volumes. The author spent two years in Iceland, visiting all the saga localities, and inspecting the ancient remains of the island. The maps are not what they should be, and there are, of course, some errors in detail, but the book shows careful labor and fills a long-existing void. It is issued by the Arna-Magnæan Commission at Copenhagen.

#### HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE.\*

BUCKLE was not the intellectual giant which he appeared to the small circle of friends—one clergyman, three ladies, and two school-boys—whose indiscriminating admiration has found expression in the wordy pages of Mr. Huth's 'Life and Writings.' He was, however, a noteworthy personage, whose character is a curious study, for in it are found blended marked moral individuality with equally marked deficiency in freshness or originality of intellect.

The trait of personal character which gives an interest and a certain dramatic unity to Buckle's life is his undivided devotion to one purpose at a time when men of talent are distracted by inconsistent ideals, are weakened by culture, and are so oppressed by the spirit of criticism that they seem to have lost the vigor necessary for efforts of creation. Buckle affords the admirable spectacle of a man who, from boyhood to the day of his death, pursued one object, and that an object, it must be added, worthy of pursuit. At the age of seventeen or eighteen he, like hundreds of other boys, dreamed of writing a great historical work. When at the age of forty he lay dying at Damascus his whole mind was still filled with his book. Of his historical speculations we hope to write on another occasion. Our present purpose is simply to note the fidelity with which Buckle clung to the object of his life. His work, his reading, his recreations were all made subordinate to his paramount aim. He read book after book, he lived retired from the world, he checked even his passion for chess, he formed his style, he resisted the fatal temptation of rushing prematurely into print—all in order that he might bring forth his 'History of Civilization,' and present it to the world in a form which might at once command attention. He obtained his well-deserved reward. For the space of two years Buckle and his speculations occupied all the reading world of England and America. No one who has ever attempted to achieve the most insignificant piece of literary labor can fail to give a tribute of praise and sympathy to a man who exhibited a kind of literary concentration which reminds one, though faintly, of the literary heroes of the last century; which recalls Johnson laboring at his dictionary, Pope's absolute consecration to poetry, or Gibbon's calm, complete, and unceasing dedication of his great powers to the work which is the monument of his genius.

But when we have given Buckle the sympathetic admiration due to systematic and concentrated intellectual effort, we cannot avoid asking the question whether the devotion of his talents to one object, which is

\* The Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle. By Alfred Henry Huth. 2 vols. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.



really the admirable trait of his life, was due either to extraordinary energy, or to that overpowering inspiration of genius which makes *deus fil diva cupido* the true motto and summary of some men's lives. There is a certain coolness and self-satisfaction about Buckle which makes it hard to believe that he was goaded on by overmastering impulse. It is impossible not to observe that individuality of character may be due either to the force within, which enables some men of heroic mould to break through all the obstacles that hinder the development of their genius, or else to the absence of those obstacles, both external and internal, which generally oppose the free growth of individuality. It is further clear that if Buckle owed something to native energy he also owed a great deal to a very singular freedom from all the circumstances which prevent men from following to the full the bent of their nature. He never knew anything like poverty. When a boy he was suffered to learn pretty much what he liked and as he liked. The death of his father gave him at once pecuniary ease and absolute independence in the choice of his career. Mr. Huth apparently thinks £1,500 a year hardly a competence; and his hero, who determined never to marry till he had an income of £3,000, and who showed throughout life a keen appreciation of the value of money, and of the comforts which money secures, probably shared Mr. Huth's opinion. Yet even in days when we are constantly taught that we cannot have original research unless men of genius are endowed with at least £1,000 a year, it is worth while remembering that Mr. Buckle's income would have seemed untold wealth to many of the leaders in literature and science. In any case he was in no way impeded in his career by that necessity for supporting life which has time after time driven genius from the line suited for its efforts.

Buckle, moreover, was never either aided or hindered by professional studies. At an age when other men have to go through all the routine and drudgery which forms the commencement of every man's professional struggles, Buckle could devote himself to the uninterrupted reading of the works which excited his interest, and which gave him the kind of knowledge he wished to obtain. We frankly admit that according to his intellectual lights he made the best of his opportunities. He had a good library, a strong memory, unlimited time, and an unlimited supply of note-books. For fourteen years he read hard, he noted hard, and was never once led to deviate from his chosen path of study. For he was as free from internal as from external hindrances. His affections seem to have been strong, but they were certainly calm. He was at least as cool a lover as the far more celebrated man who, when bidden by his father to surrender the lady of his choice, "sighed as a lover, but obeyed as a son." He enjoyed, moreover, what was for Buckle's success in mapping out his life the immense advantage of never having bowed down at the universities before the great god Culture. To share the best education of the day, to associate with one's intellectual equals or superiors, to find that men as good as one's self question one's favorite little dogmas, to know how many ideas which one thinks original are either patently absurd or else nothing but commonplaces which have been estimated at their right worth by thinkers far abler than one's self, is in many points of view an unspeakable benefit. To mix with educated companions "knocks the conceit out of a man," as the saying goes; but the same process which checks ignorant presumption is also in nine cases out of ten fatal to self-assertion; and self-assertion, though one of the least pleasing, is one of the most useful of qualities. It was a characteristic, at any rate, with which Buckle was richly endowed. The portrait at the commencement of Mr. Huth's work almost inevitably suggests that a high conceit of Mr. Buckle's own powers must at twenty-four have been one of Mr. Buckle's leading traits, and this conceit one may in perfect seriousness believe to have been a real qualification for the production of the 'History of Civilization.' If its author had passed two or three years at Oxford or Cambridge he would probably never have thought it a sufficient explanation of Burke's conduct towards the end of his life to say that Burke was mad. He would have avoided many errors and toned down a good deal of crude dogmatism; but he would also probably never have produced even the first volume of his history; he would have died at forty, leaving a mass of papers containing carefully-prepared notes of the scheme for a work too elaborate to admit of accomplishment. By the favor of circumstances Buckle passed just the kind of existence which would approve itself to an out-and-out admirer of individual freedom. His powers and his oddities, his strength and his weakness, developed themselves without restraint. Hence he possessed all the advantages of marked individuality.

That a man of talent should be allowed by circumstances to follow the natural bias of his intellect is in many ways desirable; but those who,

like Mill, have an unlimited belief in the good effects of perfect freedom from the kind of coercion enforced by the rules of society or of fashion, occasionally forget that individuality—that is, the unrestrained development of a person's own talents or idiosyncrasies—does not necessarily lead to the growth of anything like originality. A man may be free, bold, and unconventional, but be at the same time utterly wanting in mental freshness, or in that kind of insight which (just because it is a gift in itself) one terms originality. Never was this truth better illustrated than by Buckle. He was a man of more than average talent, of far more than average knowledge, and endowed with that kind of boldness which consists in never hesitating to make a strong assertion out of deference to the opinions, the judgment, or the authority of other people. He spoke, we gather from Mr. Huth's statements, with what his friends call decision, and was accustomed to dispose of the questions which perplexed inferior persons "in a few pithy sentences." But with all these qualifications for success in speculation he displays at every turn a kind of commonness of intellect which is not often found in a man of equal powers. When, for example, he was taken to the Crystal Palace, "none shared the illusions of the period more fondly than Mr. Buckle. He thought he had reached philosophically, and could prove as necessary corollaries of a certain condition of knowledge and civilization, the conclusion which numbers held without knowing why; and it was this train of thought which made the opening of 'The People's Palace' interesting to him." In other words, Buckle believed in all the commonplaces of a time when it was thought that the progress of material prosperity had secured the reign of lasting peace, and to the natural errors of the crowd added the special delusion of a theorist, that an erroneous view of the condition of society could be shown to be the necessary deduction from axiomatic principles. To share the ideas of one's age is, it may be said, human, and even a philosopher cannot escape from the common notions of his time; but this apology admits in effect that the particular philosopher is deficient in special insight, and the trait to be noted in Buckle is that even where he thinks "boldly," as the expression goes, he is, to judge from the reported fragments of his conversation, at once ignorantly dogmatic and commonplace.

"I believe," he says, "that what we have done here will not be lost to us, but also that the mind of the philosopher and that of the idiot will be equal after death. The difference we now see in them is owing to the material through which the intellect filters. If mind is immortal it cannot really be diseased. Philosophers do not like this idea."

Let any one who wishes to estimate Buckle's attitude of mind note first that there is nothing whatever in these sentiments which amounts to being even suggestive as to the conditions of the future life, and that what there is startling is nothing but the emptiest assertion about a matter on which neither Buckle nor his audience knew anything whatever. The opinion, in short, as to the future position of the soul of an idiot and the soul of a philosopher is not of much more worth than the conjecture of a child that the moon is made of cream-cheese. Its only value to the so-called thinker who uttered it was probably that it was a stone to hurl at the head of other philosophers—that is to say, persons with whose opinions he did not happen to agree. Of Buckle's almost childish manner of dealing out dogmatic estimates of other men examples enough may be found by any one who chooses to peruse Mr. Huth's pages. Two will suffice as specimens of his manner. Of Bentham he says:

"Though Bentham was one of the most eminent thinkers this or any other country has ever possessed, he was so unversed in the *art* of life (as distinguished from the *science*) that if he had possessed the requisite power he would have inflicted more misery upon England than has ever been inflicted on it by any single man."

Now, the curiosity of this estimate is not only its offhand dogmatism, but the absolute want of any critical light thrown by it on the character of the utilitarian philosopher. Probably neither Bagehot nor Matthew Arnold thinks so highly of Bentham as did Buckle, but could any one conceive either of these writers sketching the character of an eminent man in lines so ill-drawn as not even to present a decent caricature? Take, again, the letter in which Buckle compares himself and Mill:

"Once you asked me how I rated myself in comparison with Mill. I now certainly fancy that I can see things which Mill does not; but I believe that on the whole he is a greater man than I am, and will leave a greater name behind him. This is egotistical, but I am only so to those I care for; and my letters are intended to be sacredly private to you and your husband."

Of the egotism, it is true, little need be said; though when we find Buckle referring "naïvely" to his own "intellectual splendor," we may

be allowed to doubt whether it was only to friends that his self-assertion sometimes took the form of egotism. What is really noteworthy is the intellectual simplicity of measuring one man's greatness against another's. Even those who are not philosophers generally learn that this kind of measurement is utterly worthless, and should be left to children. A critic may also remark that Buckle really throws no light whatever on the genius of the man whom he admired beyond all other living authors, and further attributes to himself just that kind of insight which even admirers would probably admit not to be his strong point.

Discernment of character is, it may perhaps be said, not of necessity the *forte* of a profound thinker. Let Buckle's acumen, then, be judged by his utterances on speculative topics. On being told that Catholicism was making progress in America, he remarked:

"It must do so, for what has it to contend against there? Only Protestantism, which is inconsistency itself. I, too, was brought up a Protestant, and was taught to regard my private judgment as my birthright, of which no one could rob me. But when, in making use of my private judgment, I was led to reject Christianity, an outcry was at once raised against me for exercising this very undoubted right."

Of all the common and unsatisfactory platitudes the dogma that in religion you must believe everything or nothing is the commonest; yet Buckle propounds it as if it were at once a startling and undoubted truth. That you may have a "right" (though the term is not an apt one) to use your private judgment, and yet be responsible for the result of your using it, seems to be to many persons so hard a doctrine that a man more discerning than Buckle might be pardoned for overlooking the speculative difficulties involved in Buckle's complaint of his being blamed for the result of using his right. But Buckle knew something of history, and he ought to have known that Protestantism has, as a matter of fact, been a so much more efficient opponent of Popery than has what is called free thought, that writers such as Quinet have regretted that the Revolutionists did not establish Protestantism in France.

"The emotions," again writes Buckle, "are as much part of us as the understanding. They are as truthful, they are as likely to be right." This sentiment is certain to meet with the approval of readers who feel with Mrs. Huth that it is pleasing to think "that there were two Buckles—one cold and unfeeling as fate, . . . the other capable of feeling every vibration of a little child's heart"; or, in other words, that Buckle is to be admired because he was at once "so intellectual" and "so sentimental." But critics who try to see things as they are, cannot fail to perceive that this union without combination of intellectualism and sentimentalism is at once one of the commonest phenomena of the day, and one of the very surest signs that the person in whom it is found is not a man of commanding powers. The confusion of the undoubted fact that the emotions are part of human nature, with that most doubtful inference that therefore they are as likely to guide us to truth as is reason, is constantly leading to a misuse both of the intellect and of the heart. To fall into this confusion is no doubt the way to gain a certain amount of popular applause; but the man who falls into it gives the most certain proof that he has no claim to the position of a great thinker, and has not attained that unity of mental belief and moral feeling which is the very stamp of a strong character.

#### THE BURMESE BUDDHA.\*

NOT the least curious of the signs of the times in which we live, considered at any rate from a religious standpoint, is to be found in the fact stated by the late Sir M. Coomāra Swāmy, that "the name of Gotama Buddha rings through the salons of London, Paris, Berlin, and Boston" ("Sutta Nipāta," Introduction, p. ix.) Not merely is the critical student of the science of religion enraptured by his teachings, not only educated men, but even "the fair women of the West are evincing a desire to fathom the secrets of the system propounded by the Indian Prince-Sage." And this is all true. The name of Buddha or Gaudama was scarcely known to the world—that is, the Western world—a few years since, inasmuch that the late Rev. Spence Hardy in the introduction to his work on 'Eastern Monachism' complained that it could be found in no encyclopædia or work of reference at the time he wrote; whereas now on every hand the name of this great founder of the Religion of the East, this Light of Asia, is the subject of very general conversation; and his religious system the wonder, if not the admiration, of

all thoughtful people. It is well for us, therefore, to have reliable information about him and his teachings. The work before us affords all that is wanted in these particulars. It is written by one diametrically opposed to Buddhism as a system, by a missionary bishop, in fact, whose object in Burmah is to make the Burmese Christians; and who therefore cannot be supposed to be prejudiced in favor of the system he is wishful to overthrow; by one, moreover, who from his long residence in the country, his thorough acquaintance with its language, and his familiar intercourse with the people, is manifestly competent for the task he has undertaken; but, above all, by one who seems to possess the courage of his convictions and is not afraid to exhibit for the consideration of his readers the principles of Buddhism as he estimates them, "regardless of their merits or demerits." We do not wonder then that the book has reached a third edition, and Messrs. Trübner have done a good work in bringing it before the public in its present form as a portion of their "Oriental Series."

The great secret of the original success of Buddhism, and of its persistent continuance, is that it strikes at the very root of idolatry. It did not go so far as Islam, indeed, in this particular: it was not violently iconoclastic; but it did more, it appealed to the reason of men, it tried to persuade them that whatever admits of "birth and death"—in other words, "the creature" as opposed to "the Creator" or "the Origin"—is not worthy of supreme worship, is not a fit object for the satisfaction of the eternal hope of the human race. The truth of this must be plain to every one who looks into the system. Gotama Buddha distinctly avowed that all the gods worshipped by his contemporaries were insufficient for our human wants, because they were *created things and would die*. The word "created," indeed, may be objected to, but it amounts to the same thing; Buddha declared that these gods all came within the limits of *Jāti* and *Maranam*—i.e., birth and death—and were, therefore, not supremely divine, or really gods, to be spiritually worshipped. And so he boldly advanced up the ladder leading to heaven, and passed through the "world of desire," the "world of form," and "the world in which there is no visible form"; and there, above all these, he found his absolute existence, which he called *Nirvāna*—a condition in which, according to the old Vaidik idea, "That breathed breathlessly."

That this is the meaning of the Buddhist "*Nirvāna*" cannot be questioned by one acquainted with the whole development of the system. To say that there is no mention of "an immutable existence" or a "supreme state of being beyond the visible and the phenomenal" in the Pāli books, or those derived from the Pāli, and that therefore *Nirvāna* cannot be understood in this sense, is just as if one should say because there is no mention of a judgment to come, or of the immortality of the soul, in the books of Moses, that therefore these things are not realities or to be believed. The Pāli books of the South are undoubtedly primitive, but they contain nothing of the developed meaning of the obscure terms used in them, and therefore are insufficient for a full and intelligent interpretation of the system derived from the doctrines they teach. And hence we think our author has done well in speaking of the Gaudama, whose life he has written, as "the Buddha of the Burmese"; for undoubtedly no such assertion as the following—"the pretended Saviour (i.e., Buddha), after having taught man the way to deliver himself from the tyranny of his passions, leads him after all into the bottomless gulf of a total annihilation"—could be proved to belong to any but the Southern school of Buddhism; and this school, although primitive and sufficient for practical religion, is confessedly inadequate for the interpretation of terms which of their very nature required for their explanation the process of a religious development. Hence, in the Northern division of the Buddhist Church, which includes in it by far the largest proportion of the 300,000,000 of our fellow-men of whom our author speaks, the teaching of Gotama respecting *Nirvāna* is found to be that, at first, it was exhibited as a condition of perfect rest and release from sorrow, and that after passing through a period of scholastic refinement, during which its meaning was subtilized into a condition of nonentity, it at last, in the full growth of the system, was accepted as implying a state of absolute Being, a condition of "breathless breathing," the essence of which was *joy, purity, personality* (in the sense of *true existence*), and *eternity*.

That this is the legitimate outcome of ages of disputation on the character of this ultimate good of the Buddhists we confidently affirm in opposition to the theory propounded by our author of "an abyss of almost unfathomable darkness." We wish to repeat what we take to be an unanswerable argument against this "abyss-theory"—that Gotama Buddha, in seeking his standpoint, did not go *down* the scale of existences, but went *up*, and passed through those heavenly places (mansions, *bhuvā-*

\* 'Life or Legend of Gaudama, the Buddha of the Burmese. By the Right Reverend P. Bigandet, Bishop of Ramatha, Vicar-Apostolic of Ava and Pegu.' In 2 vols. Third edition. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.



nas) believed in by his contemporaries; and higher than them all, in that place where there is neither beginning of days nor end of life (*τὸ ἀγέννητον καὶ τὸ ἀθάνατον*). There it was we find he placed his Nirvana, and to that he directed the attention of his disciples. We may only add, what seems to be so much forgotten by our Western students, that the teaching of Buddha with respect to the attainment of this condition was not that the lower grades of life were fictions, but that we must, each of us, toil on through almost endless varieties of births, and consequent deaths, till at last, through the perfection of Karma, the totality of our actions and conduct, we may cast off the power of "the master-builder" and emerge, as the snake from its skin, into the light of unconditioned Being.

Is there not incontestably something very grand in this scheme of the Prince-Sage? Does the belief tend to make a man at all the less hopeful and earnest in life? We have to bear up, it is true, through repeated scenes of sorrow and suffering; but the result is with ourselves. We are daily making for ourselves another tabernacle, which we must occupy, it may be in heaven as an angel, or on earth as a mortal, or under the earth as a suffering ghost; but yet out of all this there is perpetually being fashioned not only a possibility, but a *certainly*, of eventual emancipation, when all things shall be put down under the feet of the great Architect, and he shall be "all and in all." We repeat, this is not despair; it is not even an irrational hope. It is the secret of the history of unnumbered millions of our fellow-men who have built up on it not altogether unlovely lives.

Another principle involved in the consideration of the existence of Buddhism is this cardinal one, that it teaches the necessity of a Saviour. Our author agrees with us here at least; he says: "It may be affirmed in favor of Buddhism that no philosophico-religious system has ever upheld, to an equal degree, the notions of a Saviour and Deliverer, and the necessity of his mission for procuring the salvation, in a Buddhist sense, of man." Now, whatever this "Buddhist sense" may or may not be, the idea still remains of a Saviour from evil. The one evil pointed out by the teacher was that which occupied the front place in all Eastern speculation—viz., the existence of sorrow, pain, and death. The remarkable feature, therefore, in this system is that it provides deliverance or salvation from this evil for all the world. And more than this, it promises to provide rest and peace. Of course, as Mr. James D'Alwis labored to show, these words rest and peace must also be understood in "a Buddhist sense"; but for our part we are contented to accept them in a human sense; and we contend that the promise of deliverance from human woe and the burden of sorrow which rests on us all is acceptable news, and must give life and virtue to the religious teaching in which it is found. It is strange that the very title of the book we are reviewing amounts to just this: "the joyful utterance of the *Tathagata*"; and that which makes the utterance or praises of this promised deliverer joyful is that he came to declare liberty and freedom, safety and release; and these things are always acceptable and joyous in the ears of the care-worn and desolate.

The method of Buddha's teaching was principally by parable or comparisons. From this sprang the familiar *Jātakas*, or "Dzats," of which several are given by our author at the end of his work. These "Dzats" are stories about the former lives or existences of persons who came within the rôle of Buddha's observation. The principle of "repeated births" being allowed, it would be easy to refer such persons to any former condition of life suited to the occasion. This, perhaps, is the most interesting part of Buddha's method of instruction, while it is the most questionable (as far as its morality is concerned). It was undoubtedly the origin of the Christian "gesta" or tales of the Middle Ages. Thus, in the '*Gesta Romanorum*' we have the exact parallel of the Buddhist "*Jātakas*." For instance, Buddha tells a story of a pious ascetic who had been formerly a hare, who on account of his self-denial was canonized as the "Hare in the Moon," and in the '*Gesta*' we have a succession of similar tales. Thus, only to take one example, in the fifty-sixth story of the second volume (Hotten's edition), referring to "vigilance in our calling," we are told how a thief tried to get into a house to steal, and how the master, knowing the danger, related aloud to his wife a story of himself when he was a thief, and in this way disconcerted the robber, who heard him reciting his experience; and the application of the story comes in just like the end of a *Jātaka*: "My beloved, the thief is the devil, the house is the human heart, the man is a good prelate, and his wife is the Church." It was precisely in this way that Buddha taught the people, and we are told that nightly in Ceylon, during the season called "Wass," the priests still recite these tales, with their applications, to the assembled

people, who listen to them all night through, chewing their betel-nut and chunam, with undiminished attention.

No doubt the monastic system adopted by Buddha also accounts for his early success as a teacher. His followers are mostly under vows to observe poverty, chastity, and obedience; and, strange to say, one of their vows also prohibits the use of stimulating drinks as well as flesh-meat. Thus was avoided the temptation to luxury which invaded the monastic establishments of Christendom, and which, more than anything else, led to their downfall. There were no "jovial crews," at any rate, in Buddhist fraternities, but then they lacked the life-giving stimulus of "labor," which St. Francis made the secret of his system ("*otiositas inimica animæ*"); and so these Buddhist monasteries, though not the scenes of luxurious indulgence, have mostly become mere centres for idleness and useless repetition of mechanical prayer.

Altogether, it is well worth the time of any one desirous of information on the subject of Buddhism to read through these two volumes of Bishop Bigandet's. We have in them a trustworthy history of the founder of a complicated religious system; and more than that: we have brought under our notice such remarkable coincidences between the Eastern and Western forms of faith as must startle the most indifferent into enquiry, and will eventually, we doubt not, cause this subject to become the leading topic of the day.

*The History and Traditions of Marblehead.* By Samuel Roads, jr. (Boston: Houghton, Osgood & Co. 1880. 8vo, pp. xviii.-433.)—The first settlers of Marblehead came from the islands of Guernsey and Jersey and from the west of England in the year 1629, and were already a rough and illiterate race of seafaring men. Nearly a hundred years later (1714) a new minister coming among them was unable to find in the place twenty families "that, upon the best examination, could stand upon their own legs, and they were generally as rude, swearing, drunken, and fighting a crew as they were poor." They had a dialect of their own which was often unintelligible to strangers, and has left traces of itself to this day; for example, "in speaking of the ceiling of a room many of the older people still call it the *planchment*." Their pronunciation of proper names was thoroughly unlettered, and Mr. Roads quotes from the '*Life of Judge Story*' what befell a clerk of the Circuit Court in Boston who called a Marblehead witness named Michael Treffery, but could not make him take the stand until the judge (recognizing a townsman) bade him "Call Mike Trevee." These and other peculiarities would have had a much shorter lease if, as was first proposed in 1636, the College had been established in Marblehead. Rarely in the early days did a youth go up thence to Cambridge; the people generally were "inclined to give their children common learning, though scholars rise but thin amongst them." Two Harvard graduates, however, natives of the town, Elbridge Gerry (born, by the way, not in 1774, as on p. 246, but in 1744) and Joseph Story, made their mark in national politics and jurisprudence. The third great name is that of John Glover, a native of Salem, indeed, but reared in Marblehead, where he owed little to book-learning. He commanded after Bunker Hill one of those "amphibious regiments of Marblehead fishermen" whose lineal successors "on the outbreak of the Rebellion were the first to leave home, the first to arrive in Boston, and subsequently . . . the first to leave the yard of the Naval Academy at Annapolis to repair and relay the track" from Annapolis Junction to Washington, and "to board *Old Ironsides*" and take her out of dock, finally manning her for the voyage to New York.

A less enviable priority belongs to Marblehead in the case of the *Desire*, the third ship built in the colony, which presently sailed to the West Indies and brought back to Boston the first negro slaves ever imported into Massachusetts—a fact on which Mr. George H. Moore lays sufficient stress in his '*History of Slavery in Massachusetts*.' In the Revolution and in the war of 1812 the skippers of Marblehead, commanding privateers or Government vessels, greatly distinguished themselves, and Captain Manly is alleged in the former struggle to have been the first to have the British flag struck to him. The embargo was endured with a fidelity worthy of the staunch Jeffersonian Republicanism of that day. The fishing interest survived it, but succumbed to the great gale of Sept. 19, 1846, and in 1879 but one vessel went from Marblehead to the Grand Banks. Bay-fishing has succeeded the more perilous mode, and is prosperous. It used to be said that there was no room in Marblehead "to confound the fisherman with the husbandman, and to spoil both, as they do in some places." In 1825, however, there sprang up a third industry, the making of shoes, which has done more to lift the town out of poverty and stagnation than anything else, not excepting

the former expedient of a lottery. Politically no change except for the worse has overtaken the inhabitants; Butler, on the Greenback-Labor platform, carried with him the great majority of shoemakers and fishermen. The latest transformation of Marblehead into a fashionable summer resort commends itself to all who have ever viewed its incomparable scenery.

Mr. Roads's narrative is a sober one, and has been anticipated in the two or three incidents which lend picturesqueness to the history of Marblehead. Such are the romance of Sir Harry Frankland and his humble bride Agnes Surriage, and the poetically embalmed Skipper Ireson's ride. In regard to the latter episode Mr. Roads maintains, contrary to Whittier, that no women took part in the tarring and feathering, or for that matter in the dragging through the town. Some progress had been made since their great-grandmothers barbarously murdered two Indian captives during King Philip's war. Ireson's innocence, too, is asserted in conformity with current belief; but while pride might have kept his lips sealed during the outrage upon his person, it seems strange that the truth should not immediately afterwards have been made clear. We say this from no desire to save the poem, which has an impersonal merit of its own. Mr. Roads is perhaps too good a Democrat to wish to linger over unpleasant reminiscences involving his own party. Still, we think he should have mentioned and explained Gerrymandering—the one permanent Marblehead contribution to "Americanisms." We wish, also, his index had been not only full but adequate. His heliotype and other illustrations are most judicious, and the volume is beautifully printed.

*On Health and Occupation.* By Benjamin Ward Richardson, M.D., F.R.S. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1879. 16mo, pp. 127.)—This little manual is divided into four parts, as follows: 1. A classification of the people of England and Wales according to their occupations; 2 and 3. Injuries to health and life that result from these various occupations; 4. "Practical methods by which the life of the different classes of workers may be rendered healthier and longer." Essentially, however, the book consists of two parts: a summary of the Registrar-General's returns on the British census of 1871 and Dr. Richardson's comments on them. The two, as we shall indicate, are of different orders of value.

Dr. Farr classifies the English and Welsh community, numbering 22,712,266 persons, as follows: 1. The professional class, 684,102 men and women (this includes the governing order, the army, teachers, and artists of all sorts, doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and druggists); 2. Domestics, numbering 5,995,171, mostly women; 3. Commercial men and women; 4. Farmers and agriculturists of all kinds, including herdsmen, and numbering 1,657,138; 5. Industrial men and women, 5,137,725 in number, of whom about thirty per cent. are women; this, the largest class of workers, includes the many kinds of manufacturing, mining, and automatic labor. Dr. Farr's sixth class, an oddly miscellaneous one, numbers 8,512,706, of which about forty-six per cent. are females; it includes children, persons of indefinite, unproductive, and disreputable occupations, and persons living entirely upon their income; this latter order numbers only 168,195 as against more than two millions of the same order reported by the French census of 1876 (see *Nation*, Feb. 27, 1879). The English are thus nearly all workers; but the supreme praiseworthiness of labor, as announced by Carlyle and other toilers, is hardly borne out by the Registrar-General's enquiries into its effects upon the health and longevity of workingmen. In his tables of longevity, clergymen and barristers head the list; "their work, arduous as it may be, is not work that kills." Catholic priests, however, are short-lived. Among the agricultural classes health and longevity are above the mean; among the commercial classes great differences in this respect are noted. Thus, grocers, booksellers, and wheelwrights surpass the average longevity; bookbinders, printers, carvers and gilders, drapers, carmen, carriers, and draymen fall far below it. The large majority of the great industrial class are short-lived, while persons of independent means, as a rule, reach length of years.

These conclusions are not new, but Dr. Farr's elaborate studies of the relation of health to occupation have contributed much that is new to their support, and they are briefly summarized in this little manual. It is when we turn from Dr. Farr's researches to Dr. Richardson's hygienic teachings that we find a difference between the authority of the two voices. Dr. Richardson is fond of generalizing, and he who generalizes commonly forgets a great many facts. Thus, he tells us that "The clothing of persons who are engaged at any kind of work should never be heavy, should always be warm" (p. 110). As to food, "An adult man

or woman ought never to take more than thirty ounces of mixed solid food in the day." As to drink, "The one and only natural fluid, water, is all-sufficient really for every purpose." Tea and coffee, the "care-breakers," in Von Bibra's expressive phrase, for many millions of working men and women, Dr. Richardson dismisses (again with some pleonasm) in these terms: "I believe that both these drinks are superseded, in regard to usefulness of action, by cocoa and chocolate," though once a day they may be used moderately "without harm" (p. 104). Dr. Richardson is, in short, an uncompromising total abstainer, tobacco in every form and all of the alcoholic stimulants coming under his ban. One may, of course, fairly disapprove of all stimulants, but Dr. Richardson's reasons for disapproval are no longer good ones. Quoting the physiological doctrine of thirty years ago, he tells us that the effects of ale, wine, and the other alcoholic stimulants are followed by "further exhaustion than has been produced by work itself, and soon a desire for more of the supposed artificial aid." Dr. Francis Anstie pointed out (in his 'Stimulants and Narcotics,' 1864, p. 156) that this belief is a survival of the vitalistic ideas. "It is our old acquaintance the Archæus, whose exhaustion, after his violent efforts in resentment of the goadings which he has endured, is represented in modern phraseology by the term 'depressive inaction.'" *Quis docebit doctores?* The reader who has followed recent enquiries upon this subject need not be reminded that this doctrine of depressive reaction, still popular with temperance reformers in England and America, is both untenable and exploded. For English readers Dr. Anstie was the first to assail it effectively, but since his researches the restatement of the question has gone farther than he would have anticipated. In 1876 Dr. C. Binz, of Bonn, for instance, announced that pure alcohol, taken in moderate quantity—i.e., not exceeding an ounce and a half—is entirely consumed in the system, producing some of the effects of a rapidly digestible food; that it reappears, under the conditions named, in none of the secretions, and leaves no trace whatever upon the breath, the smell so frequently observable after potatoes being not the smell of alcohol but of fusel-oil. Conclusions like these are of course open to debate, but in any case some recognition of them, and of similar experimental researches recently made, might be looked for in an argument professedly physiological and made by a physician speaking as with authority. In this manual, however, as in a subsequent contribution to the *Contemporary Review* on the alcohol question, Dr. Richardson does not show such an intimate familiarity as we could wish with researches which run counter to his own views. His physiology will appeal to the "cock-sure" teetotaler, but scarcely, one would fear, to those who care to know, in physiology as in literature, "the best that is thought and said" on the subject in hand.

*The Younger Edda*, also called Snorre's Edda, or the Prose Edda. An English version of the Foreword; the Fooling of Gylfe, the Afterword; Brage's Talk, the Afterword to Brage's Talk, and the Important Passages in the Poetical Diction (*Skaldskaparmál*). With an Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, and Index. By Rasmus B. Anderson, Professor of the Scandinavian Languages in the University of Wisconsin, etc. (Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1880.)—Professor Anderson's translation of 'Snorre's Edda' appears very opportunely at a time when the interest in Northern mythology has been freshly stimulated by the discoveries of Professor Sophus Bugge and Dr. Bang. The much-expected book by the former, which is to give the death-blow to Teutonic pride, will undoubtedly discredit several of Professor Anderson's statements and postulates in his preface and notes, without, however, seriously interfering with the usefulness of his book. Whether the Northern myths are indigenous, as we formerly believed, or are directly derived from Greek and Roman sources, as we may henceforth be required to believe, they will always remain important historical documents, of which the testimony cannot be disregarded. If they are robbed of part of their dignity, being convicted, as it were, of a confirmed vagabondism, they are for all that an interesting company of vagrants, revealing by their structure and complexion, by their attempts at adaptation to the physical and moral climate of the North, traces of an intellectual evolution which, if properly studied, cannot fail to yield important results. Professor Anderson, unfortunately, in his 'Norse Mythology' took the very untenable ground that the Asa faith was essentially pure and noble, and in all respects superior to the cheerfully immoral paganism of Southern Europe. We see in the present volume certain vague indications that he still adheres to this patriotic belief. Having observed, however, with what painstaking devotion and care he has pursued his Icelandic studies, and seeing in each new book from his pen evidences of a sounder and more critical scholarship, we cannot help be-



lieving that he will in time discover the injury which he does to himself by allowing his national prejudice to influence his judgment.

The Younger or Snorre's Edda, from which Professor Anderson here presents us with a series of judiciously-chosen extracts, contains a conglomeration of half-narrative, half-didactic fragments accidentally grouped under the above title. The story of the origin of this singular collection, and the various conjectures which have been advanced in regard to its character and literary worth, are ably discussed; the translation is clear and vivid, and a full vocabulary and index complete the equipment of the book as a valuable work of reference. We are not prepared to say, however, that the translator's uniform preference for archaic words is wholly commendable, although we are well aware that the English translators of the Sagas, and notably Dr. Dasent, Eiríkr Magnusson, and William Morris, have set the example in this direction. The English version of the 'Völsunga Saga,' for instance, by the two last-named scholars, will require yet another translator to reduce it to a language intelligible to others than professional philologists. Professor Anderson, to be sure, does not go to the same lengths, but he has obviously a relish for the tinge which an occasional archaism imparts to an otherwise colorless text.

All the portions of the 'Younger Edda' that would be likely to interest the general reader are to be found in the present translation. We notice that Professor Anderson has excluded that very curious portion of the Skaldskaparmál which relates to the rules of Icelandic prosody, and has reproduced in English merely the narrative portions. The Foreword, which is characterized by a certain naïve pretentiousness, not on the translator's but on the anonymous author's part, exhibits most vividly the state of intellectual obfuscation that must have prevailed in the North during the two centuries immediately succeeding the introduction of Christianity. Hebrew, Christian, and Græco-Roman myths, interspersed with distorted snatches of history, rush in a wild whirl through the brain of the unhappy scribe. Zoroaster, Noah, Odin, Saturn, Priam, Thor, and Jupiter are to him all equally real and important, and he even relates concerning Zoroaster (who, according to him, was one of the principal personages at the building of the Tower of Babel) that "he laughed before he wept, when he was born." His assumption of a judicial atti-

tude toward all these mythical and semi-mythical personages is sometimes amusing to observe, and his attempts to grope his way through the chronological labyrinth into which he has introduced himself and his reader are truly pathetic. It would be a matter of great interest (and one to which Bugge and his disciples must now undoubtedly turn their attention) to discover exactly what books were accessible to an Icelandic scholar of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. When that is known we shall soon be able to trace the historical and religious vagaries of the 'Younger Edda' to their proper sources.

In the Gylfaginning, or Fooling of Gylfe, which is the most important portion of the book, the gods give King Gylfe an account of the creation of the world and the progressive stages of its mythical history until the day of its destruction. In the Bragarœdur, which is poetically, perhaps, superior to the Gylfaginning, the god Brage relates two myths of the abduction of Idun and the origin of poetry.

\*. Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Carter (Dr. R. B.), Eyesight: Good and Bad.....	(P. Blakiston) \$1 50
Dawkins (Prof. W. B.), Early Man in Britain.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 6 50
De Kay (C.), Hesperus and Other Poems.....	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1 50
Ewald (Prof. H.), Antiquities of Israel.....	(A. D. F. Randolph & Co.)
Hardy (T.), Fellow-Townsmen: a Tale, swd.....	(Harper & Bros.) 25
Harland (Marion), Lotterings in Pleasant Paths.....	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1 75
Hebrew Migration from Egypt.....	(Trübner & Co.)
Heermans (J.), Laws of Success in Life.....	(John Heermans) 1 00
Jones (C. H.), Short Life of Charles Dickens.....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Laffan (May), Christy Carew: a Tale.....	(Henry Holt & Co.) 1 00
Little Mountain Princess: a Tale, swd.....	(A. R. Loring) 50
Lupton (Prof. N. T.), Elementary Principles of Scientific Agriculture.....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Macdonald (Rev. J. M.), Life and Writings of St. John.....	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 3 00
Packard (Dr. J. H.), Sea-Air and Sea-Bathing.....	(P. Blakiston) 50
Peloubet (S. S.), Legal Maxims in Law and Equity.....	(Geo. S. Dimes)
Roads (S., Jr.), History and Traditions of Marblehead.....	(Houghton, Osgood & Co.) 3 50
Walker (W.), Handbook of Drawing.....	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1 75
Wright (R. W.), Life: Its True Genesis.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 50
Yonge (Miss C. M.), Magnum Bonum.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 75

## Christy Carew.

By May Laffan, author of 'THE HONORABLE MISS FERRARD.' 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

"Displaying in many places passages such as one has at present the right to expect from George Eliot alone. Is the author to be her successor? There are not a few, now watching her career with great attention, who think she can be, if she only chooses."—LONDON MORNING POST.

*Dobson's Vignettes in Rhyme.*

Square 12mo, \$2.

"Cavendish's" Card Essays,

Clay's Decisions and Card-Table Talk. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

*Practical Keramics for Stu-*

dents. By C. A. Janvier. Square 8vo, \$2 50.

*Democracy: An American*

Novel. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

JUST PUBLISHED.

*An Elementary Treatise on Analytic Geometry.*

Embracing Plane Geometry and an Introduction to Geometry of Three Dimensions. By Edward A. Bowser, Prof. of Mathematics and Engineering in Rutgers College. 12mo, cloth, price \$1 75.

D. VAN NOSTRAND, PUBLISHER,  
23 Murray and 27 Warren Streets, New York.

\*. Copies sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

## The Atlas Series of Essays.

No. 11 (just published). *THEOLOGICAL UNREST.* Discussions on Science and Religion, representing both sides of the great question. By James Anthony Froude, Prof. P. G. Tait, of the Univ. of Edinburgh, and Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D. 8vo, paper, 25 cents.

No. 8. *THE GOLD ROOM.* Price 20 cents.  
"Gives a grand insight into the workings of the old 'Gold Room,' the Stock Exchange, and the Clearing-House."—*Salutem Post.*

No. 10. *MR. GLADSTONE'S INDICTMENT OF DISRAELI.* Price 10 cents. An essay by Rt. Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, Premier of England.  
"It is seldom that an administration is arraigned and condemned with such dignity and power. The article is a model political document."—*N. Y. Christian Intelligence.*

\*. The above three numbers to one address for 50 cents. For sale by newsdealers and booksellers, or sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by the publishers.

A. S. BARNES & CO.,  
111 and 113 William Street, New York.

## Rare Engravings & Etchings.

A FRESH SUPPLY.

A large lot of choice Engravings has just been received from Europe by Frederick Keppel, 243 Broadway. It includes many pleasing classical and domestic subjects in early states, especially suitable for framing, and fine modern Etchings at very moderate prices.

Correspondence is invited, and Engravings will be sent on approval to any address.

ALBERT LEVY, 4 BOND ST., New York.  
Importer of FRENCH BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.  
Terms of importation to order, per franc, 30 cents.  
Free of Duty for Libraries, per franc, 20 cents.  
Architectural and Decorative Books.  
Photographs from England, France, Spain, Italy, United States, etc.

## NEW HARDY PLANTS.

Japanese Maples, Rhododendrons, Hardy Azaleas, Magnolias, Roses, Purple Beeches, Choice and Rare Evergreens, in large quantities. All kinds of Fruit and Ornamental Trees, Shrubs, and Vines.

Price-Lists free. Descriptive Catalogues, 10 cents.

PARSONS & SONS CO. (Limited),  
Kissena Nurseries. Flushing, N. Y.

## Vitalized Phosphates: A Brain and Nerve Food.

THIS DIFFERS FROM ALL OTHER TONICS BECAUSE IT IS COMPOSED OF THE VITAL OR NERVE-GIVING PRINCIPLES OF THE OX BRAIN AND WHEAT GERM.

It strengthens the digestion and restores to the brain and nerves the elements that have been carried off by disease, worry, or overwork. It revitalizes weakly children.

For sale by druggists, or by mail \$1.

F. CROSBY, 666 Sixth Avenue, New York.

## Eminent Israelites

OF THE

## Nineteenth Century.

By HENRY SAMUEL MORAIS.

12mo, cloth, pp. 370, price \$2.

EDWARD STERN & CO., PUBLISHERS,  
PHILADELPHIA.

## Classical Writers.

EDITED BY

JOHN RICHARD GREEN.

16mo, flexible cloth, price 60 cents each.

"For a still higher order of students we have a series of 'Classical Writers.' This we cannot praise too much."—*Westminster Review*

**EURIPIDES.** By Prof. Mahaffy.

"A better book on the subject than has previously been written in English. He is scholarly and not pedantic, appreciative and yet just."—*London Academy*.

**SOPHOCLES.** By Prof. L. Campbell.

"We cannot close without again recommending the little book to all lovers of Sophocles as an able and eloquent picture of the life and work of one of the greatest dramatic writers the world has ever seen."—*London Athenaeum*.

**VERGIL.** By Prof. Nettleship.

"The information is all sound and good, and no such hand-book has before been within the reach of the young student. Any one who wishes to read Vergil intelligently, and not merely to cram so many books of the Æneid for an examination, should buy Professor Nettleship's scholarly monograph."—*London Athenaeum*.

**MILTON.** By Stopford A. Brooke.

"The reader has a swift, strong, clear account of Milton's life, and an extended critical analysis of his writings, with due attention to historical and critical details."—*Literary World*.

\* \* Others to follow.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers,

1, 3, and 5 Bond Street, New York.

**M. THOMAS & SON,**

AUCTIONEERS,

139 and 141 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

## Valuable Private Library.

MONDAY, TUESDAY, and WEDNESDAY  
Afternoons, May 17, 18, and 19, at 3 o'clock.  
valuable Theological, Scientific, and Miscellaneous Library of the late Rev. Dr. WILSON  
RUDDER, of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia.  
Many of the works are fine English editions in excellent condition.

**F. W. CHRISTER.**

Foreign Bookseller and Importer, 180 Fifth Avenue, New York.  
The principal publications of Quantin, Charpentier, Dentu, Didot, Hachette, Calman Levy, etc., on hand; also complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British authors and Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. New publications received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

1850. THIRTIETH YEAR. 1880.

**MANHATTAN LIFE**

INS. CO., NEW YORK.

ORGANIZED 1850.

OFFICES: 156 AND 158 BROADWAY.

An entire generation of successful business management.  
One thousand dollars paid out each business day for thirty years to families of deceased members.

Accumulation..... \$10,000,000  
Surplus, over..... 1,750,000  
Send for rates and terms. New form of policy comprehensive and very liberal to insureds. Agents wanted.

HENRY STOKES, President.

J. L. HALSEY, Sec'y. C. Y. WEMPLE, Vice-Pres.

**NEW ENGLAND**

MUTUAL

**Life Insurance Co. of Boston.**

Assets, . . . . . \$15,131,240 65  
Liabilities, . . . . . 13,252,078 59

Total Surplus, . . . . . \$1,879,162 06

BENJ. F. STEVENS, President.  
JOS. M. GIBBENS, Secretary.

**BROWN BROTHERS & CO.,**

49 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

For use in

THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

**AGENCY OF THE**

NEVADA BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
62 Wall Street, New York.

Capital, paid up..... \$3,000,000  
Surplus (Reserve), U. S. Bonds..... 3,500,000  
Issues Commercial and Travellers' Credits, and deals in Foreign Exchange. Offers special facilities for business with the Pacific Coast.

**A. P. TURNER & CO., Bankers,**

207 WALNUT PLACE, PHILADELPHIA.

Government, State, Municipal, and Railway Bonds and Stocks Bought and Sold at all the Exchanges. Investments prudently made in sound railway securities. Collections promptly attended to. Special attention given the obligations of the Trunk Lines and their allied Western interests; also to the financial position of the Anthracite Coal Corporations.

Direct correspondence solicited. Orders on margins not entertained.

**FARM MORTGAGES.**—A Safe and

conservative investment, netting the lender 7½ per cent. per annum. Each farm carefully examined by a paid employee. Refer by permission to E. L. Godkin, Esq., the Nation, Box 35, New York; Maverick Nat. Bank, Boston; Fifth Nat. Bank, Chicago, and many others. Circular will be sent on application.

B. LOMBARD, JR., & JAMES L. LOMBARD,  
CRESTON, IOWA.

**KOUNTZE BROTHERS,**

BANKERS,

120 BROADWAY ("EQUITABLE BUILDING"), NEW YORK.

LETTERS OF CREDIT AND CIRCULAR NOTES

Issued for the use of travellers in all parts of the world.

Bills drawn on the Union Bank of London.

Telegraphic transfers made to London, and to various places in United States.

Deposits received subject to check at sight, and interest allowed at a balance.

Government and other bonds and investment securities bought and sold on commission.

**OREGON RAILWAY & NAVIGATION COMPANY,**

20 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK, April 13, 1880.

The Board of Directors have declared a quarterly dividend of two (2) per cent., payable May 1, at the Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. The transfer-books close April 20 and reopen May 6.

HORACE WHITE, Treasurer.

I. N. PHELPS,  
JAMES STOKES,

ANSON PHELPS STOKES,  
F. P. OLCOTT.

**PHELPS, STOKES & CO., Bankers,**

45 WALL STREET, NEW YORK,

ISSUE

TRAVELLERS' CREDITS,

CIRCULAR NOTES,

AND

COMMERCIAL CREDITS,

AVAILABLE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Buy and Sell on Commission

STOCKS, BONDS, AND GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

CIRCULAR NOTES WITH LETTERS OF INDICATION.

—This system of TRAVELLERS' CREDITS is most simple and convenient. The Circular Notes are for £10, £20, and £50 Sterling, and are payable to the order of the Traveller whose signature is authenticated in the Letter of Indication. The Letter of Indication contains a List of our Correspondents, and is an introduction to leading bankers everywhere, and will answer for additional Circular Notes that may be ordered by mail.

**S. G. & G. C. WARD,**

AGENTS FOR

BARING BROTHERS & COMPANY

52 Wall Street, New York.

26 State Street, Boston.

**WILLIAM T. MEREDITH.**

37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMERCIAL PAPER.

**WINSLOW, LANIER & CO.,**

BANKERS,

26 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.  
RECEIVE THE ACCOUNTS OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN BANKERS, CORPORATIONS, AND MERCHANTS.  
NEGOTIATE RAILROAD AND CITY BONDS.  
ISSUE LETTERS OF CREDIT FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL.

**NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY**

FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60. Steerage, \$30. Prepaid Steerage Certificates, \$25.

NOTICE.

Steamer **HABSBURG**, Capt. R. Ringk, will sail as Extra Steamer on WEDNESDAY, May 12, 2 P.M., taking First-Cabin Passengers only.

For Freight or passage apply to

**OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,**  
2 Bowling Green.

**HONITON**

**Embroidery.**

A beautiful imitation in color of Irish Point Lace for trimming Wash Dresses.

**Aitken, Son & Co.,**

Broadway and Eighteenth Street.

**GOODS** from LORD & TAYLOR, New York, may be returned if found unsatisfactory when examined at home.

THE LARGE STOCK OF CHOICE

**Carpets,**

**Oil-cloths,**

**and Mattings,**

Selected by the late GEO. E. L. HYATT for spring trade, is now offered at retail, at greatly reduced prices, to close the business.

Purchasers will find it greatly to their advantage to call at once.

273 CANAL STREET, North Side, a few doors East of Broadway.

**China and Porcelain**

AT POPULAR PRICES.

White English Porcelain Dinner Sets, 100 pieces..... \$14 00  
Fine White French China Dinner Sets, complete..... 30 00  
Fine White French China Tea Sets, 44 pieces..... 7 00  
Fine Gold-band French China Tea Sets, 44 pieces..... 8 50  
Fine White French China Cups and Saucers, doz..... 3 00  
Chamber Sets, 11 pieces, decorated, \$1 25; white..... 3 00  
Silver-plated Dinner Knives, per doz..... 3 00

ALSO ALL HOUSE-FURNISHING GOODS.  
GOODS FROM WEEKLY TRADE SALES A SPECIALTY.  
New Illustrated Catalogue and Price-List mailed free on application. Estimates furnished.

**C. L. HADLEY,** Cooper Institute, N. Y. City.  
Orders boxed and shipped free of charge. Sent C.O.D. or P.O. Money-Order, Buyer Paying Freight.



